

U.S. Postal Service Competition Report

Fiscal Year 2013



Contents

Results of FY2013 Competition	1
Competition Advocate Role	1
Contracting Authority/Responsibility, Systems, and Contracting Data	1
Competition Advocate Reviews of Noncompetitive Purchase Requests of \$1M or Greater	3
SM Strategies and Tools Used to Promote Competition in FY2013	5
Barriers to Competition in FY2013	7
Summary	7

Appendices

A Competition Advocate Delegation Letter	8
B Supplying Principles & Practices Process Step 2 – 10 Determine Extent of Competition	9
C Contract Commitments and Competitive Classifications for CAMS - 80 Percent of Total Commitment Dollars	12
D Contract Commitments and Competitive Classifications for TCSS - 80 Percent of Total Commitment Dollars	16
E Contract Commitments and Competitive Classifications for eFMS - 80 Percent of Total Commitment Dollars	26
F Contract Commitments and Competitive Classifications from FPDS-NG Competition Advocate Report	28
G Noncompetitive Purchases – Management Instruction (SP S2-2011-1)	30
H Contracting Data Definitions	39

I. Results of FY2013 Competition

The competition report conveys the Postal Service's® continued commitment towards promoting competition and obtaining best value. In FY2013, the Postal Service increased its focus on competition and achieved positive results for the third year in a row. This report will illustrate the positive results that were achieved and outline some of the activities that were implemented to improve contract planning and help promote competition. The report also contains contracting data and information about noncompetitive purchases valued at \$1 million (M) or greater that were reviewed by the Competition Advocate (CA).

In FY2013, the Postal Service committed over \$5.9 billion (B) in contracting actions and awarded \$4.9B or 84.2% of those actions competitively. When compared to FY2012, the Postal Service committed over \$5B in contracting actions and awarded \$3.9B or 78.9% of those actions competitively. *We benchmarked these results against the information reported via the Federal Procurement Data System – Next Generation (FPDS-NG). In FY2013, the Federal Government reported that 64.3% of the total contracting actions were awarded competitively. If you remove the Department of Defense (DOD) contracting data, the percentage of competitive contracts reported for all other federal agencies is 79.4%.

In FY2013, the CA reviewed 61 Noncompetitive Purchase Requests (NPR), with an estimated committed value of \$631.9M over a period of five years. When compared to FY2012 the CA reviewed 72 NPRs with an estimated committed value of \$851M over a period of five years. These results represent a significant reduction in the dollar value of NPRs submitted to the CA for review in FY2013 compared to FY2012.

**Although we benchmark our results against FPDS-NG, the Postal Services competitive coding and practices are slightly different from FPDS-NG.*

II. Competition Advocate Role

The CA is responsible for promoting competition and improving the competitive performance of the Postal Service. The CA must maintain a program that includes identifying, tracking, and following up on actions to remove barriers to competition. The CA is responsible for the following:

- Challenging barriers to the competition of Postal Service requirements;
- Assisting purchase/supply chain management teams in the development of effective Supply Chain Management (SCM) solutions and obtaining best value;
- Providing independent advice to contracting officers (COs) regarding proposed noncompetitive purchases of \$1M or greater; and,
- Producing an annual report on noncompetitive purchasing activity.

The CA is appointed by the vice president, Supply Management (SM) (see Appendix A) and the CA's role and responsibilities are defined in Section 2-10, Determine Extent of Competition, of the Postal Service's Supplying Principles and Practices (SPs and Ps), and Management Instruction (MI) SP S2-2011-1, *Noncompetitive Purchases*. The complete SPs and Ps can be found internally on the USPS® Intranet site: <http://blue.usps.gov/policy/> and externally at: <http://about.usps.com/manuals/spp/html/welcome.htm>. See Appendix B for excerpts of the SPs and Ps related to competition and the CA's role.

The MI is available internally on the Postal Service Intranet site: <http://blue.usps.gov/cpim/ftp/manage/sps2111.pdf>. See Appendix G for a copy of the MI.

III. Contracting Authority/Responsibility, Systems, and Contracting Data

Contracting Authority/Responsibility

The authority and responsibility for all procurement contracting actions within the Postal Service (with the exception of real estate and related services contracts) are consolidated within the Supply Management (SM) organization. Real estate contracting authority is delegated to the vice president, Facilities.

As provided in Handbook AS-709 *Local Buying and Purchase Card Policy and Procedures*, local purchases of up to \$10 thousand (K) can be executed by individuals through delegated local buying authority. Local purchases and contract actions valued at less than \$10K are not subject to the competition requirements. Table 1 provides the approval levels for noncompetitive contract actions.

Table 1. Level of SM Approval for Non-Competitive Contract Actions

Estimated values of proposed contract action	Approved by
\$10K to \$250K	CO/Manager
>\$250K to \$10M (except for Professional and Consultant Services)	Portfolio Manager
\$10 million or greater	Vice President
\$1 million of Professional and Consultant Services	Vice President

Contracting Systems and Capture of Competitive/Noncompetitive Contract Action Classifications

Postal Service contracting actions are captured within one of three contracting systems; CAMS, TCSS, and eFMS. Contract actions are defined as new contract, delivery order, task order, work order, modification to, or termination of a contract. To promote data consistency across the contracting systems, the same competitive classification codes are maintained in all three contracting systems.

Contract Authoring and Management System (CAMS)

The CAM system is the primary contracting system for USPS contracts. The CAM system is a commercial-off-the-shelf (COTS) system that supports the purchase of supplies, services, equipment, and mail transportation (excluding surface transportation). Contracting actions are coded using the following competition classification codes:

- Below Competitive Threshold (BCT) (less than \$10K)
- Competitive
- Competitive — Simplified Purchasing
- Noncompetitive — Compelling Business Interests
- Noncompetitive — Industry Structure or Practice
- Noncompetitive — Sole Source
- Noncompetitive — Superior Performance
- Ordering Agreements — Comp Code Not Applicable
- Required Source — Policy/Legally Mandated
- Required Source — Regulated Utility
- Unauthorized Commitment

For purposes of this report, the Below Competitive Threshold (BCT) actions are excluded because they are exempt from the competition requirements. All other classifications other than competitive are considered noncompetitive.

From October 1, 2012, to September 30, 2013, there were a total of 6,740 contract actions executed equal to or above the competitive threshold (\$10K) with commitments totaling \$5.8B in CAMS. The commitment value of competitive contracting actions in CAMS equaled \$4.1B or 82% of total CAMS contract actions. The number of competitive contracting actions totaled 5,032 or 74.7% of total contracting actions in CAMS.

See Appendix C for more details related to CAMS contract actions.

Transportation Contract Support System (TCSS)

TCSS is a custom-built Postal Service system. TCSS is used to manage highway transportation contracts and payment processes. It supports the award of new contracts, modification to contracts, and renewal of contracts. Renewals of contracts are considered outside the scope of the competitive requirements because Title 39, Chapter 50, Section 5005, allows for contracts to be renewed at the existing rate by mutual agreement between the contractor or subcontractor and the Postal Service. The renewal business process requires the comparison of the existing rate to comparable contract rates and to proceed with the renewal only when the rates are competitive with similar contracts. These renewals are not included in the competitive/noncompetitive reporting due to the Title 39 requirements.

From October 1, 2012, to September 30, 2013, there were a total of 2,786 contract actions, (less renewals) executed equal to or above the competitive threshold (\$10K) in TCSS with commitments totaling \$551M. The commitment value of competitive contracting actions equaled \$535.8M or 97% of total contract actions. The number of competitive contracting actions totaled 2,288 or 82.1% of total contracting actions.

The committed values of the contracts were calculated by multiplying the annual value of the contract by the contract term because TCSS only captures the annual value of the contract to calculate payments. See Appendix D for more details related to the TCSS contract actions.

Note: From October 1, 2012, to September 30, 2013, there were a total of 2,243 renewal fixed-price contract actions executed equal to or above the competitive threshold (\$10K) in TCSS with commitments totaling \$1.4B. As stated above, these actions are not included in the competitive/noncompetitive classification due to Title 39 requirements but are included here for general information.

Facilities Management System (eFMS)

eFMS is a custom-built Postal Service system. eFMS is used to manage work orders, contracts, and payments for facility construction, repair and alteration contracts, along with real estate contracts. As noted above, contracting authority for real estate contracts has been delegated by the Postmaster General to the vice president, Facilities, and therefore such activity is not within the scope of this report. Facility construction, and repair and alteration contracts are managed within SM.

From October 1, 2012, to September 30, 2013, there were a total of 1,269 contract actions executed equal to or above the competitive threshold (\$10K) in eFMS with commitments totaling \$318.8M. The commitment value of competitive contracting actions equaled \$317M or 99.4% of total contract actions. The number of competitive contracting actions equaled 1,227 or 96.7% of total contracting actions.

See Appendix E for more details related to eFMS contract actions.

Summary of Contracting Actions

Table 2 provides the total commitments and contracting actions across the three contract management systems for the October 1, 2012, to September 30, 2013, reporting period.

Table 2. Aggregated Competition Classifications

System	Competitive/ Noncompetitive Classification	Committed \$	Number of Contract Actions	Percent of Total Committed \$	Percent of Total Contract Actions
CAMS	Competitive	\$4,135,366,575	5,032	69.8%	46.6%
eFMS	Competitive	\$317,072,142	1,227	5.4%	11.4%
TCSS	Competitive	\$535,786,048	2,288	9.0%	21.2%
Competitive Total		\$4,988,224,766	8,547	84.2%	79.2%
CAMS	Noncompetitive	\$915,208,896	1,708	15.5%	15.8%
eFMS	Noncompetitive	\$1,813,123	42	0.0%	0.4%
TCSS	Noncompetitive	\$15,759,769	498	0.3%	4.6%
Noncompetitive Total		\$932,781,788	2,248	15.8%	20.8%
Grand Total		\$5,921,006,554	10,795		

This report does not include Highway Contract Renewals (HCR) reported in the TCSS contracting system.

Sixty-six federal departments reported contract actions and commitments via the Federal Procurement Data System – Next Generation (FPDS-NG) and classified them as competitive or noncompetitive during the same reporting period as the Postal Service. This information is available via an annual Federal Procurement Data System Next Generation Competition Advocate report. For the period spanning October 1, 2012, to September 30, 2013, the FPDS-NG CA report identified \$460.8B in contract commitments of which 64.2% were awarded competitively. This compares to \$5.9B in contract commitments reported by the Postal Service, of which 84.2% were awarded competitively.

See Appendix F for more details related to the FPDS-NG Competition Advocate report.

IV. Competition Advocate Reviews of Noncompetitive Purchase Requests of \$1M or Greater

Competition Advocate Role and Reviews

The CA must complete an independent review of all noncompetitive purchase requests (NPRs) valued at \$1M or greater and provide feedback and comments to responsible COs. The COs must consider any comments and concerns raised by the CA in their evaluation and recommendation concerning the NPR and the proposed supplier. The NPRs are submitted to the COs by

the requiring organizations once the purchase/SCM team makes a preliminary purchase method recommendation to proceed noncompetitively.

From October 1, 2012, to September 30, 2013, the CA reviewed and commented on 61 requests with a total estimated contract value of \$631.9M. The requests ranged from short-term contract modifications of a few months to long-term extensions over multiple years. The requested value included in the NPR is based on the estimated future spend by the requiring organization. Each request may be executed by the CO via a single contract action or via multiple actions within the value defined in the NPR.

The full value of the NPR may never be committed if the CO negotiates a lower price or if the contract contains options that are not exercised. Table 3 outlines the total NPR estimated value by fiscal year.

Table 3. NPR Value by FY

Fiscal Year	NPR Requested Value
FY13	\$310,962,490
FY14	\$264,630,488
FY15	\$44,889,888
FY16	\$11,420,992
Total	\$631,903,858

Note: The largest three NPRs represent \$149.5M or 24% of the total NPR requested value.

Each NPR must be based on one of the four following business scenarios:

- Sole Source.
- Industry Structure or Practice.
- Compelling Business Interests.
- Superior Performance.

See Appendix B, section 2-10.3.2, for definitions of each business scenario.

Table 4 provides the details related to each business scenario justification.

Table 4. Competition Advocate NPR Review Statistics

Business Scenario Justification	Count	Requested Value	Percent of Requests	Percent of Value
Compelling Business Interests	44	\$425,335,770	72.1%	67.3%
Sole Source	12	\$74,568,088	19.7%	11.8%
Industry Structure or Practice	2	\$55,000,000	3.3%	8.7%
Superior Performance	3	\$77,000,000	4.9%	12.2%
Grand Total	61	\$631,903,858	100.0%	100.0%

Note: Some NPRs are submitted with multiple business scenario justifications. To prevent double counting, the scenario with the strongest justification is recorded.

Table 5 provides details related to the value and total requests by the Executive Leadership Team (ELT) member organization.

Table 5. NPR Value by ELT Organization

ELT	NPR \$ Value	Number of NPR Requests	Percent of NPR \$ Value	Percent of NPR Requests
CIO	\$351,903,895	26	55.7%	42.6%
CMSO	\$35,400,000	5	5.6%	8.2%
CFO	\$85,183,275	7	13.5%	11.5%
CHRO	\$8,582,000	2	1.4%	3.3%
COO	\$117,755,000	13	18.6%	21.3%
DPMG	\$15,900,000	2	2.5%	3.3%
GC	\$11,090,600	3	1.8%	4.9%
CPI	\$6,089,088	3	1.0%	4.9%
Total	\$631,903,858	61	100.0%	100.0%

Overview of High-Value Noncompetitive Contract Actions

There were 6 NPRs with estimated commitment values greater than \$30M, totaling \$244M or 38.6% of the total commitment value of NPRs submitted. Below is information about the larger dollar value NPRs that were issued in FY2013.

Chief Information Officer (CIO) Organization:

- Two NPRs were issued with estimated commitment values of \$55M for renewal of annual software maintenance agreements to support existing IT infrastructure.
- An NPR was issued to increase the contract value on an existing contract by \$50M to support annual software licenses, maintenance, and technical support of mainframes and software applications and to support the Product Tracking System and usps.com®.
- An NPR was issued to extend a contract that was initially awarded competitively to provide mid-range server hardware and software components, consumables, and related support services needed for application, web, and database servers. The estimated commitment value of the contract was \$50M for a period of two years.

Chief Financial Officer (CFO) Organization:

- An NPR was issued to exercise options to extend two large national contracts for aggregated electricity services to 4,800 accounts in five (5) deregulated states. The initial contracts were competitively awarded. These NPR extensions were needed to ensure continuity of electricity services. By extending the contracts the Postal Service locked in fixed prices and avoided risk associated with market volatility. The estimated contract commitment value of the two contracts was \$64.5M.

Chief Operating Officer (COO) Organization:

- An NPR was issued to extend a contract to ensure continuity of services for air transportation service in areas with limited service providers that could meet our schedule requirements. By extending the contract, the Postal Service was able to lock in existing rates. The estimated commitment value of the contract was \$50M.

V. SM Strategies and Tools Used to Promote Competition in FY2013

The Postal Service devoted a significant amount of effort and resources throughout the year to increase competitive opportunities. In FY2013, the Postal Service increased its focus on promoting competition to obtain best value in the contracting process by implementing the following programs, tools, and materials:

Competition Advocate Internal Webpage

- To help educate employees on the benefits of competition, the CA developed a competition webpage. The webpage includes guidance and information about the benefits of competition, training materials, and forms.

Identified Two Delegate Competition Advocates

- In FY2013, the CA identified and trained two managers to act as delegated CA when the CA is unavailable. The delegated CAs also helped develop communications and materials to promote competition and serve as advisors in the review of non-competitive contracts.

Report of Significant Expiring Contracts

- In FY2013, the CA developed a new quarterly report of expiring contracts. The initial report was distributed by the CFO to all postal officers. The report identifies all significant contracting actions that will be expiring in the next six months. The report was developed to increase the visibility of the non-competitive actions among the top executives, improve the purchase planning process, and reduce the number of non-competitive contracts that were issued due to lack of planning. The initial report was enhanced to include a closed-loop process, to connect the COs with their Internal Business Partner and document planned contracting actions for each of the expiring contract actions listed on the report.

Simplified Purchasing

- To help promote competition for small buys, we updated our policies and implemented a new process for simplified purchasing. Simplified purchasing is a streamlined competitive purchasing practice used to purchase commercially available goods and services valued at \$10K to \$250K. Simplified purchasing can (a) reduce administrative costs, (b) promote efficiency and economy in contracting, and (c) lessen unnecessary burdens on both the Postal Service and its suppliers.

Competition Advocate Communications

The CA promoted competition through various communications:

- Developed briefings and training material that is shared with SM employees and all new officers to help promote competition.
- Reviewed NPRs and made recommendations to only issue short-term extensions for contracts when lack of planning or emergency buys were indicated as justification in the NPR.
- Conducted one-on-one communication with COs to help develop competitive sourcing strategies.
- Conducted meetings with requiring organizations to discuss the role of the CA, to promote early involvement of the SM organization in sourcing decisions, and to incorporate competition as a sourcing strategy when appropriate.
- Conducted meetings with suppliers to discuss the role of the CA and to encourage them to register their interest in doing business with the Postal Service via eSourcing.

Supplier Communications and Supplier Webpage

SM organization communicated to its suppliers through multiple channels including: Supplier webpage on usps.com, *Re: Supply* newsletter, supplier email list, supplier conferences, and supplier outreach programs. SM developed a robust Supplier webpage that provides suppliers with information on “How to Do Business with USPS” and register to become a new supplier. These communication vehicles help promote a clearer understanding within the supplier community of the needs of the Postal Service and promote competition and supplier diversity by identifying the process for suppliers to register to become a new supplier via USPS eSourcing supplier registration tool.

Supplier Outreach

In FY2013, the SM participated in 27 industrial, congressional, and federally sponsored supplier outreach events. At these events, the SM provided suppliers with guidance on how to do business with the SM and whom to contact for answers to commodity-specific contracting questions. Suppliers were also offered help in registering as a new supplier using the Supplier Registration tool. Knowledgeable SM professionals conducted one-on-one capability briefings with interested suppliers and provided supplier information to SM category teams.

As a result of these events and open communications, the SM received noteworthy recognition in FY2013:

- The Top Government Agency for Multicultural Business Opportunities – *DiversityBusiness.com* - 2013
- Chair of OSDDBU Interagency Collaboration Committee
- National Minority Supplier Development Council – National Board member
- Chair National Minority Supplier Development Council's Procurement Committee – Capital Region

In addition, the SM was an active member and participated on a number of supplier diversity councils including: National Center for American Indian Enterprise Development, U.S. Hispanic Chamber of Commerce, Women Business Enterprise Council, U.S. Women Chamber of Commerce, Office of Small Disadvantage Business Utilization, National Minority Supplier Development, Capital Region Minority Supplier Development Council, U.S. Pan Asian American Chamber of Commerce, and League of United Latin American Citizens.

eSourcing – Supplier Registration Tool

The Postal Service uses an electronic sourcing solution to enhance and streamline the competitive sourcing practices. eSourcing is a COTS software solution that supports electronic supplier registration, requests for information, requests for proposal, requests for quotes, reverse auctions, and combinatorial optimization events.

In FY2013, our total registered supplier count, increased to over 12,300 suppliers in eSourcing and were eligible to be invited to bid on competitive solicitations. Suppliers were encouraged to register through the *Re: Supply* newsletter, CO communications, FedBizOps, and supplier outreach events.

The eSourcing solution helps the Postal Service and suppliers streamline the competitive sourcing process by combining the proposal submittal and evaluation process into one solution. This significantly reduces the time between activities that are often seen in the traditional paper-based proposal process.

Category Sourcing Strategy Plans (CSSP)

Portfolio teams developed CSSPs for commodities that represent 80% of total spend. The CSSP process is used to identify the market trends, analyze category spend, determine the extent of competition and supplier diversity within the supply base, and evaluate future business needs. This results in the development of best-value sourcing strategies. CSSPs are updated each year and reviewed by SM managers to help promote competition, improve project planning, and optimize the supplier base.

Electronic Catalogs and National Contracts

The Postal Service implemented national contracts to streamline repetitive buys for products that are used across the organization. Products offered on national contracts are made available to employees as catalogs using the eBuy2 system. We have implemented over 120 electronic catalogs to streamline the sourcing process. Contracts are generally competed and issued to one or more suppliers. Competition occurs not only at the initial contract award, but through ongoing competition throughout the contract lifecycle. The eBuy2 system allows purchasers to compare similar items from different suppliers to make the best value decision. Catalog suppliers are permitted to reduce their prices throughout the contract term. This produces ongoing competition amongst the suppliers beyond the initial contract award.

SM/CFO Monthly Reports

In FY2013, SM developed a set of centralized and standardized dashboard reports. The dashboard reports are updated weekly and report contracting performance and metrics against SM goals. Monthly SM/CFO contract and spend reports are produced that provide management visibility to the past and future sourcing actions underway within the organization. The report contains multiple sub-reports related to spending trends: spend with top suppliers; contracting actions for the month; significant long term contracts; and future sourcing actions in the pipeline with preliminary sourcing plans. These reports help raise the visibility of current and future sourcing actions and initiate earlier dialog on how to improve competition and achieve best value.

VI. Barriers to Competition in FY2013

The levels of competition achieved will vary each year depending on the types of products or services required, the availability of suppliers in the marketplace, supplier capabilities, and other factors. In FY2013, we continued to see positive trends in the percentage of contracts that were awarded competitively and efforts to compete requirements.

Table 6. Historical Results

	FY11	FY12	FY13
Competitive Dollars	\$1.2B	\$3.9B	\$4.9B
% Competitive Contract Dollars	78.8%	78.9%	84.2%

Note: FY11 only represents a half year of data

Some examples of barriers to competition during FY2013 within the Postal Service were the following:

- **Size and Scale of Postal Service Infrastructure:** Given the size and scale of the Postal Service's operations, many of our IT solutions and mail processing equipment are customized and designed specifically to meet our business requirements. Given the complexity to design, deploy, and support these large systems, competition can be cost prohibitive and limited to the initial supplier until the system no longer meets the needs of the business.
- **Lack of Advanced Planning and Stop Gap Measures:** There were some instances where the requiring organization did not communicate with the CO early enough in the sourcing process to compete the requirements. There is improvement in this area with the development of the new quarterly report of expiring contracts. There were several instances where noncompetitive requests to extend an existing contract were issued for a short amount of time to give the team more time to complete market research and compete the requirements.
- **Sole Source:** Some of the software, equipment, or parts for the equipment are only provided by the original equipment manufacturer (OEM) or sub-contractor who worked on the project during initial implementation. OEM suppliers hold patents, license, or proprietary rights that prohibit us from using other suppliers. Extensive and costly reverse engineering would be required to introduce competition in these instances. Reverse engineering also requires specially trained and skilled engineering and specialized resources to execute efficiently.

VII. Summary

- The Postal Service continues to improve its competition statistics. This report demonstrates our progress and the level of effort that the Postal Service has exercised to educate the organization on the benefits of competition. The new quarterly report of expiring contracts is helping to ensure that existing requirements are reviewed early in the process to allow enough time to compete opportunities if the requirements are suitable for competition. New requirements and contracts that have historically been awarded noncompetitively are also reviewed to determine if new suppliers or alternative solutions are emerging. The Postal Service is committed to promoting competition and achieving best value solutions.

The United States Postal Service FY2013 Competition Report was prepared by Donna L. Schoenbeck, Competition Advocate.

Appendix A. Competition Advocate Delegation Letter

SUSAN M. BROWNELL
VICE PRESIDENT, SUPPLY MANAGEMENT



July 30, 2012

DONNA SCHOENBECK

SUBJECT: Appointment as Postal Service Competition Advocate

Effective July 30, I hereby appoint you as the Postal Service's Competition Advocate.

As Competition Advocate, you are responsible for:

- Challenging barriers to the competition of Postal Service requirements;
- Assisting purchase supply chain management (SCM) teams in the development of effective SCM solutions and obtaining best value;
- Providing independent advice to contracting officers regarding proposed noncompetitive purchases; and
- Producing an annual report on noncompetitive purchasing activity.

Please see Supplying Principles and Practices (SPs and Ps) 2-10.3.4 for a full discussion of these responsibilities and the factors you should consider when reviewing noncompetitive purchase requests.

If you are absent from the office, you may redelegate one of your team leaders as acting Competition Advocate.

I have every confidence you will execute these duties to the best of your ability and in the best interests of the Postal Service.

This appointment will remain in effect until it is rescinded.

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Susan M. Brownell".

cc: Supply Management Leadership Team
Douglas P. Glair

475 L'ENFANT PLAZA SW
WASHINGTON, DC 20260-6200
202-268-4040
FAX: 202-268-2755
WWW.USPS.COM

Appendix B.

Supplying Principles & Practices Process Step 2 – 10

Determine Extent of Competition

The following sections of the SPs and Ps are provided for easy reference. They were extracted from the SPs and Ps on September 30, 2011:

2-10 Determine Extent of Competition

The goal of Postal Service supplying activities is the achievement of best value for the Postal Service, and sourcing and material management decisions are made on this basis. Best value is defined in the Best Value Supplying Principle as “the outcome that provides the optimal combination of elements such as lowest TCO, technology, innovation and efficiency, assurance of supply, and quality consistent with the Postal Service’s needs and market strategy.” In the sourcing area, best value is generally achieved through competition because competition brings market forces to bear and helps purchase/SCM teams compare the relative value of proposals and prices.

2-10.1 Market Surveillance

Market surveillance is the continuous process of updating market research and is used to obtain a sense of the products and services available in the market place and their various characteristics and capabilities. It includes activities designed to keep the purchase/SCM team abreast of current technology, product development, and innovative services. Market surveillance should focus on industry trends, technological change, and economic conditions. The awareness of the market obtainable through market surveillance gives the Postal Service the information necessary to maximize the opportunity for competition, thus increasing the likelihood of achieving best value.

2-10.2 Competitive Purchases

Competitive purchases should be made on the basis of adequate competition whenever feasible. Adequate competition means the solicitation of a sufficient number of the best qualified suppliers to ensure that the required quality and quantity of goods and services are obtained when needed and that the price is fair and reasonable.

2-10.3 Noncompetitive Purchases

2-10.3.1 General

Noncompetitive purchases greater than \$10,000 are subject to the following procedures.

2-10.3.2 Business Scenarios

In some circumstances, Postal Service business and competitive objectives may be met most effectively through a noncompetitive purchase. The following four scenarios discuss the instances when it is appropriate to use the noncompetitive method:

- **Sole Source** — Only one supplier exists, capable of satisfying a requirement.
- **Industry structure or practice** — The industry producing or supplying the required goods or services is structured in a manner that renders competition ineffective (e.g., when purchasing goods or services that are regulated, such as utilities, or when purchasing from nonprofit or educational institutions that do not compete in the market place).
- **Compelling business interests** — There is a business interest that is so compelling that purchasing noncompetitively outweighs the benefits of competition. These situations can include, but are not limited to, the urgency of the requirement, a supplier innovation that furthers Postal Service business objectives, or undue cost or delay would result from a contract award to a new supplier.
- **Superior Performance** — A supplier’s superior performance and its contributions to the Postal Service’s business and competitive objectives merit award of a particular purchase. For example, extending the term or expanding the scope of a contract for substantially the same goods or services when a supplier has performed at such a high level that the extension or expansion is well deserved, or when a supplier’s superior performance has made such performance beneficial to Postal Service operations.

2-10.3.3 Noncompetitive Purchase Request

If it has been preliminarily recommended that the purchase should be made noncompetitively, then the requesting organization must submit a Noncompetitive Purchase Request (NPR) to the contracting officer. The NPR must include the business scenario and rationale for the noncompetitive purchase. While the extent and detail of the request will depend on the particular purchase, the purchase complexity, and the purchase’s potential dollar value, all elements of the NPR must be addressed fully and completely. If the requesting organization determines that an element is irrelevant or cannot be addressed fully and completely, a statement

explaining the circumstances must be provided. In addition, the NPR must be signed and dated by the originator/preparer and his/her management chain. If the estimated cost of the request exceeds \$250,000, then it must also be signed and dated by the responsible Vice President. The signers of the request must also certify to the conflicts of interest and nondisclosure statements which are included in the NPR. To view the NPR format, see MI SP-S2-2010-1, Noncompetitive Purchases.

The NPR is sent by the requesting organization to the contracting officer for evaluation and recommendation. If the purchase is valued at \$1 million or more, the contracting officer must forward a copy to the Competition Advocate (CA) at competitionadvocate@usps.gov and provide the CA with a timeline for the contract as well as any other pertinent information if practical. See below sections for more information about the CA role.

2-10.3.4 Competition Advocate

2-10.3.4.a. General

The CA is appointed by the VP, SM, and is generally responsible for promoting competition throughout the purchasing process, challenging barriers to the competition of Postal Service requirements, and assisting purchase/SCM teams in the development of effective supply chain management (SCM) solutions and obtaining best value. More specifically, the CA completes an independent review of all NPRs for purchases valued at \$1 million or more, provides independent advice to contracting officers regarding proposed noncompetitive purchases, and produces an annual report on noncompetitive purchase activity; the report is submitted to the VP, SM, and posted on-line for both internal Postal Service and public audiences.

2-10.3.4.b. Review

During the review, the CA should consider the following questions:

- Is the NPR based on sound business reasons that serve to promote the business and competitive interests of the Postal Service?
- Is the NPR justified under one of the four "Business Scenarios" (see section 2-10.3.1, Business Scenarios, for more detail)?
- Are the specifications and statements of work included in the NPR restrictive in any way? For example, are geographic preferences justified, or are brand name products or unnecessary experience or bonding required?
- Is the NPR complete and accurate? If any elements of the NPR are not addressed, is the rationale convincing?
- Does the NPR reflect commercial best practices?
- Does the NPR contradict or negatively impact the Postal Service's commitment to and efforts towards supplier diversity?
- What plans for future competition of the requirement are both realistic and achievable?

After the review of the NPR is complete, the CA must prepare his/her recommendations to the contracting officer. This recommendation should provide advice to the contracting officer during his/her evaluation and recommendation on the NPR.

2-10.3.5 Contracting Officer Evaluation and Recommendation

The contracting officer reviews the NPR and performs a written evaluation of the proposed supplier's past performance and supplier capability and any other matter he or she believes will lead to a more informed and effective purchase decision, including the Competition Advocate's guidance if applicable. The contracting officer must document his or her approval or disapproval if within his or her delegated authority, or forward his or her recommendation through the management chain to the appropriate approval authority. The contracting officer's or approval authority's approval of the NPR does not constitute approval of contract award, and, in all cases, the contracting officer is required to negotiate reasonable pricing and terms and conditions prior to contract award, including review of relevant market pricing, when applicable, and a determination that the contract price is fair and reasonable.

2-10.3.6 Collaboration

If the parties should disagree as to purchase method, they should collaborate in order for the final purchase method determination or recommendation to be made. This collaboration will provide the requesting organization with the opportunity to bring forth any new or changed information which may affect the opinions of the contracting officer and approval authority. The CA may assist in these deliberations.

2-10.3.7 Purchase Method Approval Authorities

The portfolio managers (Facilities, Mail Equipment, Services, Supplies, and Transportation) within Supply Management may approve purchase method recommendations for noncompetitive purchases valued up to \$10 million, except for noncompetitive purchases of professional, technical, and consultant services valued at \$1 million or more. Requests for noncompetitive professional, technical, and consultant services purchases valued at \$1 million or more, and all other noncompetitive purchases valued at \$10 million or more, must be reviewed and approved by the VP, SM. Portfolio managers may delegate up to \$250,000 of this purchase method approval authority to subordinate Team Leaders or managers in the applicable purchasing organizations.

2-10.3.8 Publicizing

All noncompetitive contract awards valued at more than \$1 million must be publicized in the Government Point of Entry (GPE) and other media, as appropriate.

2-10.3.9 Documentation

See section 2-40.3.2, Contract Files for Noncompetitive Contracts, for information on required documentation.

2-10.4 Other Topics Considered

Section 2-9, Perform Switching Cost Analysis

Section 2-20, Develop and Finalize Sourcing Strategy

Section 2-41, Obtain Selected Reviews and Approvals

Appendix C.

Contract Commitments and Competitive Classifications for CAMS - 80 Percent of Total Commitment Dollars

From October 1, 2012, to September 30, 2013, there were a total of 6,740 contract actions executed equal to or above the competitive threshold (\$10K) with commitments totaling \$5.1B in CAMS. The actions included commitments and de-commitments. The following table highlights the top 80 percent of supplier commitments based on commitment totals and includes the competitive classification breakdown by supplier.

Supplier Name	Competitive Classification	Sum of Committed \$	Contract Actions	% of Total	Cumulative %
FEDERAL EXPRESS CORPORATION	Competitive	\$1,438,165,189.66	1		
FEDERAL EXPRESS CORPORATION Total		\$1,438,165,189.66	1	28.5%	28.5%
ACCENTURE FEDERAL SERVICES	Competitive	\$163,203,007.29	140		
	Noncompetitive - Compelling Business Interests	\$340,883.11	2		
ACCENTURE FEDERAL SERVICES Total		\$163,543,890.40	142	3.2%	31.7%
UNIVERSAL MCCANN	Competitive	\$130,000,000.00	1		
UNIVERSAL MCCANN Total		\$130,000,000.00	1	2.6%	34.3%
VICTORY PACKAGING	Competitive	\$125,643,175.13	6		
VICTORY PACKAGING Total		\$125,643,175.13	6	2.5%	36.8%
NORTHROP GRUMMAN INFORMATION	Competitive	\$105,622,338.06	128		
	Noncompetitive - Industry Structure or Practice	\$240,000.65	1		
NORTHROP GRUMMAN INFORMATION Total		\$105,862,338.71	129	2.1%	38.9%
AEKO KULA	Competitive	\$102,475,600.50	8		
AEKO KULA Total		\$102,475,600.50	8	2.0%	40.9%
AT & T CORPORATION	Competitive	\$95,720,556.51	17		
AT & T CORPORATION Total		\$95,720,556.51	17	1.9%	42.8%
KALITTA AIR, LLC	Competitive	\$94,530,811.00	1		
KALITTA AIR, LLC Total		\$94,530,811.00	1	1.9%	44.7%
MCI COMMUNICATIONS SERVICES INC	Competitive	\$86,874,841.97	10		
	Noncompetitive - Compelling Business Interests	\$1,300,000.00	1		
MCI COMMUNICATIONS SERVICES INC Total		\$88,174,841.97	11	1.7%	46.4%
HEWLETT PACKARD CO	Competitive	\$55,064,197.45	198		
	Noncompetitive - Compelling Business Interests	\$16,342,269.22	26		
HEWLETT PACKARD CO Total		\$71,406,466.67	224	1.4%	47.8%
IBM CORP	Noncompetitive - Compelling Business Interests	\$52,439,406.13	28		
	Noncompetitive - Sole Source	\$11,933,182.15	14		
	Competitive	\$5,700,386.00	9		
	Noncompetitive - Industry Structure or Practice	\$42,750.00	1		
IBM CORP Total		\$70,115,724.28	52	1.4%	49.2%
CONVERGYS GOVERNMENT SOLUTIONS LLC	Noncompetitive - Compelling Business Interests	\$42,355,908.88	7		
	Competitive	\$26,145,125.68	10		
CONVERGYS GOVERNMENT SOLUTIONS LLC Total		\$68,501,034.56	17	1.4%	50.6%
NORTHROP GRUMMAN TECHNICAL SERVICES INC	Competitive	\$68,248,970.04	6		
NORTHROP GRUMMAN TECHNICAL SERVICES INC Total		\$68,248,970.04	6	1.4%	51.9%
SIEMENS INDUSTRY INC	Noncompetitive - Compelling Business Interests	\$30,267,293.13	18		
	Noncompetitive - Sole Source	\$30,098,749.00	8		
	Ordering Agreements - Comp Coding Not Applicable	\$3,100,000.00	1		
	Competitive	\$1,363,291.92	6		
	Competitive - Simplified Purchasing	\$1,212,843.64	24		
	Below Competitive Threshold	\$30,000.00	1		
SIEMENS INDUSTRY INC Total		\$66,072,177.69	58	1.3%	53.2%

Supplier Name	Competitive Classification	Sum of Committed \$	Contract Actions	% of Total	Cumulative %
EMC CORPORATION	Competitive	\$54,390,023.00	19		
	Noncompetitive - Compelling Business Interests	\$5,235,256.60	7		
	Noncompetitive - Industry Structure or Practice	\$3,103,161.60	5		
EMC CORPORATION Total		\$62,728,441.20	31	1.2%	54.5%
HP ENTERPRISE SERVICES LLC	Competitive	\$58,570,484.41	113		
HP ENTERPRISE SERVICES LLC Total		\$58,570,484.41	113	1.2%	55.6%
NEW BREED LEASING OF NJ INC	Competitive	\$49,278,718.22	7		
NEW BREED LEASING OF NJ INC Total		\$49,278,718.22	7	1.0%	56.6%
CSC APPLIED TECHNOLOGIES LLC	Competitive	\$46,586,065.00	9		
CSC APPLIED TECHNOLOGIES LLC Total		\$46,586,065.00	9	0.9%	57.5%
NORTHROP GRUMMAN SECURITY	Noncompetitive - Sole Source	\$46,013,809.00	10		
	Below Competitive Threshold	\$102,648.00	8		
NORTHROP GRUMMAN SECURITY Total		\$46,116,457.00	18	0.9%	58.4%
DELOITTE CONSULTING LLP	Competitive	\$45,514,897.54	121		
DELOITTE CONSULTING LLP Total		\$45,514,897.54	121	0.9%	59.3%
ABM SECURITY SERVICES	Competitive	\$40,097,975.46	46		
ABM SECURITY SERVICES Total		\$40,097,975.46	46	0.8%	60.1%
WORLD WIDE TECHNOLOGY INC	Competitive	\$39,961,601.69	61		
WORLD WIDE TECHNOLOGY INC Total		\$39,961,601.69	61	0.8%	60.9%
NCR CORP	Competitive	\$37,928,654.76	13		
	Noncompetitive - Compelling Business Interests	\$787,985.50	1		
	Competitive - Simplified Purchasing	\$93,500.00	2		
	Noncompetitive - Industry Structure or Practice	\$58,296.00	1		
NCR CORP Total		\$38,868,436.26	17	0.8%	61.7%
UPS WORLDWIDE FORWARDING INC	Noncompetitive - Sole Source	\$32,616,456.00	6		
	Noncompetitive - Compelling Business Interests	\$2,207,750.00	1		
	Competitive	\$276,262.23	1		
UPS WORLDWIDE FORWARDING INC Total		\$35,100,468.23	8	0.7%	62.4%
CEPHEID	Noncompetitive - Sole Source	\$35,092,373.45	4		
CEPHEID Total		\$35,092,373.45	4	0.7%	63.1%
ECS FEDERAL INC	Competitive	\$33,570,699.00	1		
ECS FEDERAL INC Total		\$33,570,699.00	1	0.7%	63.8%
PITNEY BOWES GOVERNMENT	Competitive	\$31,895,563.68	5		
	Noncompetitive - Compelling Business Interests	\$900,000.00	2		
PITNEY BOWES GOVERNMENT Total		\$32,795,563.68	7	0.6%	64.4%
DRAFTFCB INC	Noncompetitive - Compelling Business Interests	\$32,480,242.00	14		
DRAFTFCB INC Total		\$32,480,242.00	14	0.6%	65.0%
TRANS EXECUTIVE AIRLINES OF HAWAII INC	Competitive	\$31,634,352.71	2		
TRANS EXECUTIVE AIRLINES OF HAWAII INC Total		\$31,634,352.71	2	0.6%	65.7%
DELOITTE & TOUCHE LLP	Competitive	\$31,224,975.45	8		
DELOITTE & TOUCHE LLP Total		\$31,224,975.45	8	0.6%	66.3%
SHUERT INDUSTRIES INC	Competitive	\$29,957,758.25	4		
SHUERT INDUSTRIES INC Total		\$29,957,758.25	4	0.6%	66.9%
MOTOROLA SOLUTIONS INC	Noncompetitive - Compelling Business Interests	\$16,456,527.80	34		
	Competitive	\$10,206,190.68	37		
	Noncompetitive - Sole Source	\$2,750,832.00	1		
	Unauthorized Commitment	\$414,822.43	1		
MOTOROLA SOLUTIONS INC Total		\$29,828,372.91	73	0.6%	67.5%
THE WEST RIVER GROUP	Competitive	\$29,569,988.00	3		
THE WEST RIVER GROUP Total		\$29,569,988.00	3	0.6%	68.1%
PETROLEUM TRADERS CORP	Required Source - Policy/Legally Mandated	\$28,596,020.41	71		
PETROLEUM TRADERS CORP Total		\$28,596,020.41	71	0.6%	68.6%

Supplier Name	Competitive Classification	Sum of Committed \$	Contract Actions	% of Total	Cumulative %
INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS MACHINES	Noncompetitive - Sole Source	\$21,378,228.27	12		
	Competitive	\$2,366,899.00	5		
	Noncompetitive - Compelling Business Interests	\$1,652,182.00	9		
	Competitive - Simplified Purchasing	\$96,499.00	2		
INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS MACHINES Total		\$25,493,808.27	28	0.5%	69.1%
XO HOLDINGS	Competitive	\$25,097,165.17	15		
XO HOLDINGS Total		\$25,097,165.17	15	0.5%	69.6%
SUTHERLAND GLOBAL SERVICES INC	Competitive	\$25,046,152.96	4		
SUTHERLAND GLOBAL SERVICES INC Total		\$25,046,152.96	4	0.5%	70.1%
AT&T MOBILITY NAT'L ACCTS LLC	Competitive	\$21,643,000.00	6		
	Noncompetitive - Compelling Business Interests	\$660,000.00	1		
AT&T MOBILITY NAT'L ACCTS LLC Total		\$22,303,000.00	7	0.4%	70.6%
HOLLINGSWORTH LOGISTICS GROUP	Competitive	\$22,041,864.60	5		
HOLLINGSWORTH LOGISTICS GROUP Total		\$22,041,864.60	5	0.4%	71.0%
GENERAL DYNAMICS INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY	Competitive	\$20,719,153.66	31		
	Noncompetitive - Compelling Business Interests	\$699,661.88	4		
GENERAL DYNAMICS INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY Total		\$21,418,815.54	35	0.4%	71.4%
ASHTON POTTER USA LTD	Competitive	\$21,200,676.60	31		
ASHTON POTTER USA LTD Total		\$21,200,676.60	31	0.4%	71.8%
MBA CONSULTING SERVICES INC	Competitive	\$20,605,817.93	67		
MBA CONSULTING SERVICES INC Total		\$20,605,817.93	67	0.4%	72.3%
WEBCOR PACKAGING CORPORATION	Competitive	\$20,044,865.00	3		
WEBCOR PACKAGING CORPORATION Total		\$20,044,865.00	3	0.4%	72.7%
ORANGE COUNTY CONTAINER	Competitive	\$20,043,365.00	3		
ORANGE COUNTY CONTAINER Total		\$20,043,365.00	3	0.4%	73.0%
ALLIANCE PACKAGING LLC	Competitive	\$20,000,000.00	2		
ALLIANCE PACKAGING LLC Total		\$20,000,000.00	2	0.4%	73.4%
FEDCENTRIC TECHNOLOGIES LLC	Noncompetitive - Compelling Business Interests	\$19,337,303.00	8		
FEDCENTRIC TECHNOLOGIES LLC Total		\$19,337,303.00	8	0.4%	73.8%
TRIENDA LEXINGTON LOGISTICS	Competitive	\$18,014,026.50	6		
TRIENDA LEXINGTON LOGISTICS Total		\$18,014,026.50	6	0.4%	74.2%
SENNETT SECURITY PRODUCTS	Competitive	\$17,688,485.42	37		
SENNETT SECURITY PRODUCTS Total		\$17,688,485.42	37	0.4%	74.5%
MDI	Required Source - Policy/Legally Mandated	\$17,247,780.29	6		
	Competitive	\$23,001.54	1		
MDI Total		\$17,270,781.83	7	0.3%	74.9%
ORACLE AMERICA INC	Noncompetitive - Compelling Business Interests	\$13,375,262.51	26		
	Competitive	\$1,433,518.16	1		
	Noncompetitive - Industry Structure or Practice	\$1,047,231.70	1		
ORACLE AMERICA INC Total		\$15,856,012.37	28	0.3%	75.2%
BRAD HALL & ASSOC INC	Required Source - Policy/Legally Mandated	\$15,705,420.91	18		
BRAD HALL & ASSOC INC Total		\$15,705,420.91	18	0.3%	75.5%
BANK OF AMERICA	Competitive	\$15,500,000.00	2		
BANK OF AMERICA Total		\$15,500,000.00	2	0.3%	75.8%
CCL LABEL INC	Competitive	\$15,335,111.77	23		
CCL LABEL INC Total		\$15,335,111.77	23	0.3%	76.1%
MCCANN- ERICKSON USA INC	Competitive	\$15,000,000.00	6		
MCCANN- ERICKSON USA INC Total		\$15,000,000.00	6	0.3%	76.7%
CENVEO CORP	Competitive	\$15,000,000.00	2		
CENVEO CORP Total		\$15,000,000.00	2	0.3%	76.4%

Supplier Name	Competitive Classification	Sum of Committed \$	Contract Actions	% of Total	Cumulative %
HARRIS IT SERVICES CORPORATION	Competitive	\$13,796,258.86	8		
HARRIS IT SERVICES CORPORATION Total		\$13,796,258.86	8	0.3%	77.0%
AQUILENT INC	Competitive	\$13,284,791.53	50		
AQUILENT INC Total		\$13,284,791.53	50	0.3%	77.2%
AVAYA GOVERNMENT SOLUTIONS	Noncompetitive - Compelling Business Interests	\$13,237,021.00	5		
AVAYA GOVERNMENT SOLUTIONS Total		\$13,237,021.00	5	0.3%	77.5%
AUTOMATED CONTROL TECHNOLOGIES LLC	Competitive	\$10,790,209.11	17		
	Noncompetitive - Compelling Business Interests	\$2,112,323.71	19		
	Competitive - Simplified Purchasing	\$117,768.75	1		
AUTOMATED CONTROL TECHNOLOGIES LLC Total		\$13,020,301.57	37	0.3%	77.8%
GOVERNMENT SERVICES CORP	Required Source - Policy/Legally Mandated	\$13,005,247.65	6		
GOVERNMENT SERVICES CORP Total		\$13,005,247.65	6	0.3%	78.0%
SEA STAR LINE, LLC	Noncompetitive - Compelling Business Interests	\$12,836,880.00	2		
SEA STAR LINE, LLC Total		\$12,836,880.00	2	0.3%	78.3%
MANSFIELD OIL COMPANY	Required Source - Policy/Legally Mandated	\$12,825,572.46	34		
MANSFIELD OIL COMPANY Total		\$12,825,572.46	34	0.3%	78.5%
TERADATA GOVERNMENT SYSTEMS LLC	Noncompetitive - Compelling Business Interests	\$10,505,661.01	6		
	Competitive	\$1,760,924.46	6		
	Noncompetitive - Sole Source	\$392,991.00	2		
TERADATA GOVERNMENT SYSTEMS LLC Total		\$12,659,576.47	14	0.3%	78.8%
CARGO FORCE INC	Noncompetitive - Compelling Business Interests	\$6,910,964.43	4		
	Competitive	\$5,715,291.14	4		
CARGO FORCE INC Total		\$12,626,255.57	8	0.2%	79.0%
United Network Services, Inc.	Competitive	\$12,619,571.44	4		
United Network Services, Inc. Total		\$12,619,571.44	4	0.2%	79.3%
INGENICO INC	Competitive	\$12,522,800.00	3		
INGENICO INC Total		\$12,522,800.00	3	0.2%	79.5%
STERIGENICS EAST CORP	Noncompetitive - Sole Source	\$12,318,237.08	2		
STERIGENICS EAST CORP Total		\$12,318,237.08	2	0.2%	79.8%
CITIBANK N A	Noncompetitive - Compelling Business Interests	\$8,170,423.96	2		
	Competitive	\$4,000,000.00	1		
CITIBANK N A Total		\$12,170,423.96	3	0.2%	80.0%

Appendix D.

Contract Commitments and Competitive Classifications for TCSS - 80 Percent of Total Commitment Dollars

From October 1, 2012, to September 30, 2013, there were a total of 2,786 new contract actions executed equal to or above the competitive threshold (\$10K) with commitments totaling \$533M. The committed value of the contracts was calculated by multiplying the annual value of the contract by the contract term as TCSS only captures the annual value of the contract. The following table highlights the top 80 percent of supplier commitments based on commitment totals.

Supplier Name	Competitive Classification	Sum of Committed \$	Contract Actions	% of Total	Cumulative %
POSTAL FLEET SERVICES INC	COMPETITIVE	\$23,649,190	20		
POSTAL FLEET SERVICES INC Total		\$23,649,190	20	4.3%	4.3%
COMMERCIAL TRAILER LEASING INC	COMPETITIVE	\$23,024,412	39		
COMMERCIAL TRAILER LEASING INC Total		\$23,024,412	39	4.2%	8.5%
VELTRI INC	COMPETITIVE	\$13,744,781	7		
	NONCOMPETITIVE - SOLE PURCHASE	\$582,825	2		
	COMPETITIVE - SIMPLIFIED PURCHASE	\$176,362	1		
	NONCOMPETITIVE - COMPELLING BUSINESS INTERESTS	\$18,527	1		
VELTRI INC Total		\$14,522,496	11	2.6%	11.1%
B & B TRUCKING INC	COMPETITIVE	\$12,189,145	15		
	NONCOMPETITIVE - COMPELLING BUSINESS INTERESTS	\$72,161	1		
B & B TRUCKING INC Total		\$12,261,306	16	2.2%	13.3%
T&T ENTERPRISES OF OHIO INC	COMPETITIVE	\$10,229,283	9		
	COMPETITIVE - SIMPLIFIED PURCHASE	\$1,592,140	2		
	NONCOMPETITIVE - COMPELLING BUSINESS INTERESTS	\$26,227	1		
T&T ENTERPRISES OF OHIO INC Total		\$11,847,649	12	2.1%	15.5%
MATHESON MAIL TRANSPORTATION INC	COMPETITIVE	\$11,396,634	4		
	NONCOMPETITIVE - COMPELLING BUSINESS INTERESTS	\$74,416	3		
MATHESON MAIL TRANSPORTATION INC Total		\$11,471,051	7	2.1%	17.6%
ROOD TRUCKING CO INC	COMPETITIVE	\$10,810,556	5		
	NONCOMPETITIVE - SOLE PURCHASE	\$67,107	1		
ROOD TRUCKING CO INC Total		\$10,877,663	6	2.0%	19.5%
DAVIS MAIL SERVICES INC	COMPETITIVE	\$9,703,922	10		
DAVIS MAIL SERVICES INC Total		\$9,703,922	10	1.8%	21.3%
EAGLE EXPRESS LINES INC	COMPETITIVE	\$9,231,503	32		
	NONCOMPETITIVE - COMPELLING BUSINESS INTERESTS	\$80,778	3		
	NONCOMPETITIVE - SOLE PURCHASE	\$25,248	1		
EAGLE EXPRESS LINES INC Total		\$9,337,529	36	1.7%	23.0%
POSTAL TRANSPORT INC	COMPETITIVE	\$8,093,421	12		
	NONCOMPETITIVE - SOLE PURCHASE	\$445,208	1		
	NONCOMPETITIVE - COMPELLING BUSINESS INTERESTS	\$32,722	1		
POSTAL TRANSPORT INC Total		\$8,571,352	14	1.6%	24.5%
BOWMAN TRAILER LEASING	COMPETITIVE	\$8,348,403	9		
BOWMAN TRAILER LEASING Total		\$8,348,403	9	1.5%	26.1%
MARK W CLEMONS	COMPETITIVE	\$8,012,393	5		
MARK W CLEMONS Total		\$8,012,393	5	1.5%	27.5%
MLM TRUCKING INC	COMPETITIVE	\$7,119,617	3		
MLM TRUCKING INC Total		\$7,119,617	3	1.3%	28.8%

Supplier Name	Competitive Classification	Sum of Committed \$	Contract Actions	% of Total	Cumulative %
SKYLINE MAIL CARRIERS INC	NONCOMPETITIVE - COMPELLING BUSINESS INTERESTS	\$5,711,713	3		
	COMPETITIVE	\$1,306,135	1		
SKYLINE MAIL CARRIERS INC Total		\$7,017,848	4	1.3%	30.1%
CAMINANTE TRUCKING	COMPETITIVE	\$6,874,271	5		
	NONCOMPETITIVE - COMPELLING BUSINESS INTERESTS	\$28,433	1		
CAMINANTE TRUCKING Total		\$6,902,703	6	1.3%	31.3%
ALAN RITCHEY LLC	COMPETITIVE	\$6,393,598	6		
ALAN RITCHEY LLC Total		\$6,393,598	6	1.2%	32.5%
C JS TRANSPORTATION SERVICE INC	COMPETITIVE - SIMPLIFIED PURCHASE	\$3,890,169	8		
	COMPETITIVE	\$2,198,636	8		
C JS TRANSPORTATION SERVICE INC Total		\$6,088,805	16	1.1%	33.6%
FBT TRANSPORT LLC	COMPETITIVE	\$6,020,736	7		
	NONCOMPETITIVE - COMPELLING BUSINESS INTERESTS	\$14,055	1		
FBT TRANSPORT LLC Total		\$6,034,791	8	1.1%	34.7%
FALLEN TRUCKING CO INC	COMPETITIVE	\$5,775,165	3		
FALLEN TRUCKING CO INC Total		\$5,775,165	3	1.0%	35.7%
VIP COURIER EXPRESS LLC	COMPETITIVE	\$5,481,626	1		
VIP COURIER EXPRESS LLC Total		\$5,481,626	1	1.0%	36.7%
PAT SALMON & SONS INC	COMPETITIVE	\$5,392,194	15		
PAT SALMON & SONS INC Total		\$5,392,194	15	1.0%	37.7%
DAVENPORT TRANSPORTATION INC	COMPETITIVE	\$4,602,368	9		
	NONCOMPETITIVE - SOLE PURCHASE	\$173,646	3		
DAVENPORT TRANSPORTATION INC Total		\$4,776,014	12	0.9%	38.6%
BEAM BROS TRUCKING INC	COMPETITIVE	\$4,470,126	25		
	NONCOMPETITIVE - COMPELLING BUSINESS INTERESTS	\$153,299	4		
	NONCOMPETITIVE - SOLE PURCHASE	\$47,548	2		
BEAM BROS TRUCKING INC Total		\$4,670,973	31	0.8%	39.4%
AEH TRUCKING CO.	COMPETITIVE	\$4,652,245	4		
AEH TRUCKING CO. Total		\$4,652,245	4	0.8%	40.3%
CARROLL FULMER LOGISTIC	COMPETITIVE	\$4,610,790	43		
	NONCOMPETITIVE - SOLE PURCHASE	\$36,540	1		
CARROLL FULMER LOGISTIC Total		\$4,647,329	44	0.8%	41.1%
LE-MAR HOLDINGS INC	COMPETITIVE	\$4,209,985	6		
LE-MAR HOLDINGS INC Total		\$4,209,985	6	0.8%	41.9%
DDA TRANSPORT INC	COMPETITIVE	\$3,653,578	6		
	NONCOMPETITIVE - COMPELLING BUSINESS INTERESTS	\$86,595	4		
DDA TRANSPORT INC Total		\$3,740,173	10	0.7%	42.5%
FRANCIA TRUCKING INC	COMPETITIVE	\$3,399,028	2		
	NONCOMPETITIVE - COMPELLING BUSINESS INTERESTS	\$34,837	2		
FRANCIA TRUCKING INC Total		\$3,433,865	4	0.6%	43.2%
HEARNS ENTERPRISES LLC	COMPETITIVE	\$3,338,113	2		
HEARNS ENTERPRISES LLC Total		\$3,338,113	2	0.6%	43.8%
MARK R FALLON	COMPETITIVE	\$3,152,114	2		
MARK R FALLON Total		\$3,152,114	2	0.6%	44.3%
LUIS SAMBUCETTI	COMPETITIVE	\$2,437,286	3		
	COMPETITIVE - SIMPLIFIED PURCHASE	\$660,042	1		
LUIS SAMBUCETTI Total		\$3,097,328	4	0.6%	44.9%

Supplier Name	Competitive Classification	Sum of Committed \$	Contract Actions	% of Total	Cumulative %
GREG A JOHNSON TRUCKING INC	COMPETITIVE	\$3,034,012	3		
GREG A JOHNSON TRUCKING INC Total		\$3,034,012	3	0.6%	45.5%
NICHOLAS TRUCKING CO INC	COMPETITIVE	\$3,032,102	1		
NICHOLAS TRUCKING CO INC Total		\$3,032,102	1	0.6%	46.0%
R L TRUCKING INC	COMPETITIVE	\$2,890,418	15		
	COMPETITIVE - SIMPLIFIED PURCHASE	\$133,973	1		
R L TRUCKING INC Total		\$3,024,391	16	0.5%	46.6%
VMW EXPRESS LLC	COMPETITIVE	\$2,775,975	2		
VMW EXPRESS LLC Total		\$2,775,975	2	0.5%	47.1%
WESTWOOD CARTAGE INC	COMPETITIVE	\$2,599,908	2		
	NONCOMPETITIVE - COMPELLING BUSINESS INTERESTS	\$117,630	3		
WESTWOOD CARTAGE INC Total		\$2,717,538	5	0.5%	47.6%
NORTHLAND TRUCKING ENTERPRISES	COMPETITIVE	\$2,713,051	1		
NORTHLAND TRUCKING ENTERPRISES Total		\$2,713,051	1	0.5%	48.0%
AREA STORAGE & TRANSFER INC	COMPETITIVE	\$2,061,486	5		
	NONCOMPETITIVE - COMPELLING BUSINESS INTERESTS	\$460,855	1		
	COMPETITIVE - SIMPLIFIED PURCHASE	\$151,689	1		
	NONCOMPETITIVE - SOLE PURCHASE	\$14,000	1		
AREA STORAGE & TRANSFER INC Total		\$2,688,029	8	0.5%	48.5%
BYRD TRUCKING CO	COMPETITIVE	\$2,662,766	4		
BYRD TRUCKING CO Total		\$2,662,766	4	0.5%	49.0%
COP TRANSPORTATION LLC	COMPETITIVE	\$1,572,209	2		
	COMPETITIVE - SIMPLIFIED PURCHASE	\$1,063,376	3		
COP TRANSPORTATION LLC Total		\$2,635,585	5	0.5%	49.5%
K & K TRUCKING OF ROCKWELL, LLC	COMPETITIVE	\$2,628,370	3		
K & K TRUCKING OF ROCKWELL, LLC Total		\$2,628,370	3	0.5%	50.0%
FLORIDA CARRIERS & BROKER SERVICES INC	COMPETITIVE	\$2,613,935	3		
FLORIDA CARRIERS & BROKER SERVICES INC Total		\$2,613,935	3	0.5%	50.4%
C & K DELIVERY INC	COMPETITIVE	\$2,534,331	2		
C & K DELIVERY INC Total		\$2,534,331	2	0.5%	50.9%
W & L MAIL SERVICE	COMPETITIVE	\$2,524,344	4		
W & L MAIL SERVICE Total		\$2,524,344	4	0.5%	51.4%
MCCORMICKS LLC	COMPETITIVE	\$2,407,000	1		
MCCORMICKS LLC Total		\$2,407,000	1	0.4%	51.8%
MAIL DELIVERY SERVICES INC	COMPETITIVE	\$2,178,108	8		
	COMPETITIVE - SIMPLIFIED PURCHASE	\$170,045	2		
MAIL DELIVERY SERVICES INC Total		\$2,348,153	10	0.4%	52.2%
GRAHAM & GRAHAM TRK LLC	COMPETITIVE	\$1,681,704	2		
	COMPETITIVE - SIMPLIFIED PURCHASE	\$663,869	2		
GRAHAM & GRAHAM TRK LLC Total		\$2,345,573	4	0.4%	52.6%
D B CARTAGE INC	COMPETITIVE	\$2,340,033	2		
D B CARTAGE INC Total		\$2,340,033	2	0.4%	53.1%
C BLACKBURN INC	COMPETITIVE - SIMPLIFIED PURCHASE	\$1,463,888	2		
	COMPETITIVE	\$864,822	1		
C BLACKBURN INC Total		\$2,328,710	3	0.4%	53.5%
MARATHON MAIL SERVICE INC	COMPETITIVE	\$2,299,527	2		
MARATHON MAIL SERVICE INC Total		\$2,299,527	2	0.4%	53.9%
VELTRI TRUCKING INC	COMPETITIVE	\$1,652,247	1		
	NONCOMPETITIVE - SOLE PURCHASE	\$638,118	2		
VELTRI TRUCKING INC Total		\$2,290,366	3	0.4%	54.3%

Supplier Name	Competitive Classification	Sum of Committed \$	Contract Actions	% of Total	Cumulative %
TURBO LOGISTICS CORP	COMPETITIVE	\$1,955,856	24		
	NONCOMPETITIVE - COMPELLING BUSINESS INTERESTS	\$319,705	3		
TURBO LOGISTICS CORP Total		\$2,275,561	27	0.4%	54.7%
SANCHEZ TRANSPORTATION	COMPETITIVE	\$2,240,325	1		
SANCHEZ TRANSPORTATION Total		\$2,240,325	1	0.4%	55.1%
STINGRAY DISTRIBUTING	COMPETITIVE	\$2,198,482	1		
	NONCOMPETITIVE - COMPELLING BUSINESS INTERESTS	\$11,164	1		
STINGRAY DISTRIBUTING Total		\$2,209,646	2	0.4%	55.5%
TGR TRANSPORT INC	COMPETITIVE	\$2,181,441	5		
TGR TRANSPORT INC Total		\$2,181,441	5	0.4%	55.9%
MIDWEST TRANSPORT INC	COMPETITIVE	\$1,703,201	26		
	NONCOMPETITIVE - COMPELLING BUSINESS INTERESTS	\$403,982	5		
	NONCOMPETITIVE - SOLE PURCHASE	\$23,176	1		
MIDWEST TRANSPORT INC Total		\$2,130,360	32	0.4%	56.3%
LARRY JENSEN MAIL TRANSPORT LLC	COMPETITIVE	\$2,094,446	1		
LARRY JENSEN MAIL TRANSPORT LLC Total		\$2,094,446	1	0.4%	56.7%
BLUE TICK INCORPORATED	COMPETITIVE	\$2,089,903	2		
BLUE TICK INCORPORATED Total		\$2,089,903	2	0.4%	57.1%
GILBERT EXPRESS INC	COMPETITIVE	\$2,044,197	13		
	NONCOMPETITIVE - SOLE PURCHASE	\$31,100	1		
GILBERT EXPRESS INC Total		\$2,075,297	14	0.4%	57.5%
EDWARD J LOCKERBY	COMPETITIVE - SIMPLIFIED PURCHASE	\$2,058,402	4		
EDWARD J LOCKERBY Total		\$2,058,402	4	0.4%	57.8%
ALFARO TRUCKING	COMPETITIVE	\$1,962,989	1		
ALFARO TRUCKING Total		\$1,962,989	1	0.4%	58.2%
TRACIE MCCORMICK INC	COMPETITIVE	\$1,773,415	21		
	NONCOMPETITIVE - SOLE PURCHASE	\$95,688	1		
	NONCOMPETITIVE - COMPELLING BUSINESS INTERESTS	\$74,710	2		
TRACIE MCCORMICK INC Total		\$1,943,813	24	0.4%	58.5%
MCCORMICK TRUCKING INC	COMPETITIVE	\$1,747,350	9		
	NONCOMPETITIVE - COMPELLING BUSINESS INTERESTS	\$67,675	1		
MCCORMICK TRUCKING INC Total		\$1,815,025	10	0.3%	58.9%
MATHESON POSTAL SERVICES INC	COMPETITIVE	\$954,330	5		
	NONCOMPETITIVE - COMPELLING BUSINESS INTERESTS	\$849,673	11		
MATHESON POSTAL SERVICES INC Total		\$1,804,003	16	0.3%	59.2%
PACIFIC ALLIANCE TRANSPORT INC	COMPETITIVE	\$1,637,327	6		
	COMPETITIVE - SIMPLIFIED PURCHASE	\$141,234	1		
	NONCOMPETITIVE - COMPELLING BUSINESS INTERESTS	\$19,403	1		
PACIFIC ALLIANCE TRANSPORT INC Total		\$1,797,964	8	0.3%	59.5%
C JS TRANSPORTATION SERVICES INC	COMPETITIVE	\$1,749,396	3		
C JS TRANSPORTATION SERVICES INC Total		\$1,749,396	3	0.3%	59.8%
BJ TRUCKING CO INC	COMPETITIVE	\$1,708,335	5		
	NONCOMPETITIVE - COMPELLING BUSINESS INTERESTS	\$29,379	1		
BJ TRUCKING CO INC Total		\$1,737,714	6	0.3%	60.2%
JOHN W RITTER TRKG INC	COMPETITIVE	\$1,736,320	6		
JOHN W RITTER TRKG INC Total		\$1,736,320	6	0.3%	60.5%

Supplier Name	Competitive Classification	Sum of Committed \$	Contract Actions	% of Total	Cumulative %
BRIAN D SCHNEIDER	COMPETITIVE	\$1,521,359	5		
	COMPETITIVE - SIMPLIFIED PURCHASE	\$212,095	1		
BRIAN D SCHNEIDER Total		\$1,733,454	6	0.3%	60.8%
TNSTUMPPF ENTERPRISES LLC	COMPETITIVE	\$1,728,078	6		
TNSTUMPPF ENTERPRISES LLC Total		\$1,728,078	6	0.3%	61.1%
OSMO ENTERPRISE	COMPETITIVE	\$1,697,099	1		
OSMO ENTERPRISE Total		\$1,697,099	1	0.3%	61.4%
PABLO DE JONGH MEDINA	COMPETITIVE	\$1,639,750	2		
PABLO DE JONGH MEDINA Total		\$1,639,750	2	0.3%	61.7%
ROBERT DEMAGISTRIS	COMPETITIVE	\$1,574,080	4		
	COMPETITIVE - SIMPLIFIED PURCHASE	\$15,800	1		
ROBERT DEMAGISTRIS Total		\$1,589,880	5	0.3%	62.0%
BANCROFT & SONS TRANSPORTATION INC	COMPETITIVE	\$1,586,957	11		
BANCROFT & SONS TRANSPORTATION INC Total		\$1,586,957	11	0.3%	62.3%
ZETRICK LLC	COMPETITIVE	\$1,552,925	4		
ZETRICK LLC Total		\$1,552,925	4	0.3%	62.6%
HARTMANN TRUCKING	COMPETITIVE	\$1,472,371	4		
HARTMANN TRUCKING Total		\$1,472,371	4	0.3%	62.8%
GOT MAIL LLC	COMPETITIVE	\$1,462,178	1		
GOT MAIL LLC Total		\$1,462,178	1	0.3%	63.1%
FREEDOM TRANS USA	COMPETITIVE	\$1,354,944	11		
	NONCOMPETITIVE - SOLE PURCHASE	\$44,263	1		
FREEDOM TRANS USA Total		\$1,399,207	12	0.3%	63.4%
STARCO INC	COMPETITIVE	\$1,398,436	3		
STARCO INC Total		\$1,398,436	3	0.3%	63.6%
POSTAL CARRIER CORP	COMPETITIVE	\$1,351,919	3		
POSTAL CARRIER CORP Total		\$1,351,919	3	0.2%	63.9%
FOREMAN BROTHERS INC	COMPETITIVE	\$1,305,066	5		
FOREMAN BROTHERS INC Total		\$1,305,066	5	0.2%	64.1%
IDEAS EXPRESS SERVICES	COMPETITIVE	\$745,968	1		
	COMPETITIVE - SIMPLIFIED PURCHASE	\$545,337	1		
IDEAS EXPRESS SERVICES Total		\$1,291,305	2	0.2%	64.3%
NOBLE BAY EQUITIES LLC	COMPETITIVE	\$1,276,639	4		
NOBLE BAY EQUITIES LLC Total		\$1,276,639	4	0.2%	64.6%
BOWEN TRANSPORTATION INC	COMPETITIVE	\$1,271,946	2		
BOWEN TRANSPORTATION INC Total		\$1,271,946	2	0.2%	64.8%
CHERYL LYNN RAPUE	COMPETITIVE	\$1,263,020	2		
CHERYL LYNN RAPUE Total		\$1,263,020	2	0.2%	65.0%
BECO INC	COMPETITIVE	\$1,183,494	11		
	NONCOMPETITIVE - COMPELLING BUSINESS INTERESTS	\$65,772	1		
BECO INC Total		\$1,249,266	12	0.2%	65.2%
J & J TRUCKING OF MADISON LLC	COMPETITIVE	\$1,228,152	4		
J & J TRUCKING OF MADISON LLC Total		\$1,228,152	4	0.2%	65.5%
SALANGER TRUCKING	COMPETITIVE	\$1,202,181	2		
SALANGER TRUCKING Total		\$1,202,181	2	0.2%	65.7%
HOYT BROTHERS TRUCKING INC	COMPETITIVE	\$1,197,974	1		
HOYT BROTHERS TRUCKING INC Total		\$1,197,974	1	0.2%	65.9%
MARROQUIN EXPRESS INC	COMPETITIVE	\$1,178,160	2		
MARROQUIN EXPRESS INC Total		\$1,178,160	2	0.2%	66.1%

Supplier Name	Competitive Classification	Sum of Committed \$	Contract Actions	% of Total	Cumulative %
BOUGHER & DUNN, LLC	COMPETITIVE	\$1,176,947	5		
BOUGHER & DUNN, LLC Total		\$1,176,947	5	0.2%	66.3%
G'S LOGISTICS INC	COMPETITIVE	\$1,148,464	2		
	NONCOMPETITIVE - COMPELLING BUSINESS INTERESTS	\$27,563	1		
G'S LOGISTICS INC Total		\$1,176,027	3	0.2%	66.5%
CMB TRUCKING	COMPETITIVE	\$1,159,476	1		
CMB TRUCKING Total		\$1,159,476	1	0.2%	66.8%
AMAZIN EXPRESS	COMPETITIVE - SIMPLIFIED PURCHASE	\$1,156,766	2		
AMAZIN EXPRESS Total		\$1,156,766	2	0.2%	67.0%
ALBERT MARTELL	COMPETITIVE	\$1,155,745	4		
ALBERT MARTELL Total		\$1,155,745	4	0.2%	67.2%
J & W ENTERPRISES	COMPETITIVE	\$1,150,625	1		
J & W ENTERPRISES Total		\$1,150,625	1	0.2%	67.4%
DRAKE OF CONKLIN, LLC	COMPETITIVE - SIMPLIFIED PURCHASE	\$863,690	2		
	COMPETITIVE	\$273,730	1		
DRAKE OF CONKLIN, LLC Total		\$1,137,420	3	0.2%	67.6%
CLIFFORD B FINKLE JR IN	COMPETITIVE	\$889,503	4		
	NONCOMPETITIVE - COMPELLING BUSINESS INTERESTS	\$235,689	2		
CLIFFORD B FINKLE JR IN Total		\$1,125,192	6	0.2%	67.8%
MBM TRANSPORT INC	COMPETITIVE - SIMPLIFIED PURCHASE	\$1,107,525	1		
MBM TRANSPORT INC Total		\$1,107,525	1	0.2%	68.0%
THUNDER RIDGE TRANS INC	COMPETITIVE	\$1,104,792	2		
THUNDER RIDGE TRANS INC Total		\$1,104,792	2	0.2%	68.2%
METROPOLITAN TRUCKING INC	COMPETITIVE	\$1,103,033	5		
METROPOLITAN TRUCKING INC Total		\$1,103,033	5	0.2%	68.4%
GLOVER'S SOLUTIONS INC	COMPETITIVE	\$1,089,416	1		
	NONCOMPETITIVE - COMPELLING BUSINESS INTERESTS	\$11,655	1		
GLOVER'S SOLUTIONS INC Total		\$1,101,071	2	0.2%	68.6%
TOM SMITH CONTRACTING LLC	COMPETITIVE	\$1,100,120	1		
TOM SMITH CONTRACTING LLC Total		\$1,100,120	1	0.2%	68.8%
FX LOGISTICS LLC	COMPETITIVE	\$1,040,823	8		
FX LOGISTICS LLC Total		\$1,040,823	8	0.2%	69.0%
ROYALTY TRUCKING INC	COMPETITIVE	\$983,567	1		
	NONCOMPETITIVE - COMPELLING BUSINESS INTERESTS	\$39,922	2		
ROYALTY TRUCKING INC Total		\$1,023,488	3	0.2%	69.2%
ELBAR INC	COMPETITIVE	\$1,016,384	2		
ELBAR INC Total		\$1,016,384	2	0.2%	69.4%
MCRAES US MAIL SERVICE INC	COMPETITIVE	\$1,011,259	1		
MCRAES US MAIL SERVICE INC Total		\$1,011,259	1	0.2%	69.5%
TRIPLE R AND SONS LLC, INC	COMPETITIVE	\$993,497	2		
TRIPLE R AND SONS LLC, INC Total		\$993,497	2	0.2%	69.7%
US LOGISTICS LLC	COMPETITIVE	\$961,779	3		
US LOGISTICS LLC Total		\$961,779	3	0.2%	69.9%
CAPE COD EXPRESS INC	COMPETITIVE - SIMPLIFIED PURCHASE	\$922,267	2		
CAPE COD EXPRESS INC Total		\$922,267	2	0.2%	70.1%
UNITED EXPRESS SERVICE INC	COMPETITIVE	\$910,336	1		
UNITED EXPRESS SERVICE INC Total		\$910,336	1	0.2%	70.2%

Supplier Name	Competitive Classification	Sum of Committed \$	Contract Actions	% of Total	Cumulative %
TRIUMPH TRUCKING	COMPETITIVE - SIMPLIFIED PURCHASE	\$901,665	3		
TRIUMPH TRUCKING Total		\$901,665	3	0.2%	70.4%
RNC TRANSPORTATION	COMPETITIVE	\$879,399	1		
RNC TRANSPORTATION Total		\$879,399	1	0.2%	70.5%
URSA MAJOR CORPORATION	COMPETITIVE	\$865,657	10		
URSA MAJOR CORPORATION Total		\$865,657	10	0.2%	70.7%
RUSSELL LYONS	COMPETITIVE - SIMPLIFIED PURCHASE	\$865,644	2		
RUSSELL LYONS Total		\$865,644	2	0.2%	70.9%
THE STAGELINE COMPANY	COMPETITIVE	\$852,198	1		
THE STAGELINE COMPANY Total		\$852,198	1	0.2%	71.0%
LANGE TRUCKING INC	NONCOMPETITIVE - COMPELLING BUSINESS INTERESTS	\$845,238	7		
LANGE TRUCKING INC Total		\$845,238	7	0.2%	71.2%
ALAN RITCHEY INC	COMPETITIVE	\$810,785	4		
ALAN RITCHEY INC Total		\$810,785	4	0.1%	71.3%
TR STONE TRUCKING CO	COMPETITIVE	\$795,697	1		
	NONCOMPETITIVE - COMPELLING BUSINESS INTERESTS	\$11,582	1		
TR STONE TRUCKING CO Total		\$807,279	2	0.1%	71.5%
CHANELLE & BRANDOS TRANSPORT, LLC	COMPETITIVE	\$804,153	1		
CHANELLE & BRANDOS TRANSPORT, LLC Total		\$804,153	1	0.1%	71.6%
PONY EXPRESS DELIVERY INC	COMPETITIVE	\$804,111	6		
PONY EXPRESS DELIVERY INC Total		\$804,111	6	0.1%	71.8%
IDEAS EXPRESS SERVICE	COMPETITIVE	\$798,441	1		
IDEAS EXPRESS SERVICE Total		\$798,441	1	0.1%	71.9%
MAIL CONTRACTORS OF ARKANSAS INC	COMPETITIVE	\$626,783	7		
	NONCOMPETITIVE - COMPELLING BUSINESS INTERESTS	\$159,501	2		
MAIL CONTRACTORS OF ARKANSAS INC Total		\$786,284	9	0.1%	72.0%
BAYDAN TRANSPORT	COMPETITIVE	\$784,811	1		
BAYDAN TRANSPORT Total		\$784,811	1	0.1%	72.2%
MAPLES TRUCK LINE INC	COMPETITIVE	\$779,357	4		
MAPLES TRUCK LINE INC Total		\$779,357	4	0.1%	72.3%
SCOTT LAROCCA	COMPETITIVE	\$774,368	1		
SCOTT LAROCCA Total		\$774,368	1	0.1%	72.5%
BETTENCOURT TRANSPORT	COMPETITIVE	\$745,791	4		
	NONCOMPETITIVE - COMPELLING BUSINESS INTERESTS	\$21,831	2		
BETTENCOURT TRANSPORT Total		\$767,622	6	0.1%	72.6%
CLIFFORD B FINKLE	COMPETITIVE	\$764,745	1		
CLIFFORD B FINKLE Total		\$764,745	1	0.1%	72.7%
MTC LOGISTICS	COMPETITIVE	\$761,103	1		
MTC LOGISTICS Total		\$761,103	1	0.1%	72.9%
APRIL M SLANKARD	COMPETITIVE	\$432,362	1		
	COMPETITIVE - SIMPLIFIED PURCHASE	\$324,550	2		
APRIL M SLANKARD Total		\$756,912	3	0.1%	73.0%
KEN GEORGE TRUCKING INC	COMPETITIVE	\$748,593	1		
KEN GEORGE TRUCKING INC Total		\$748,593	1	0.1%	73.2%
GAMALIEL AMOROS GONZALEZ	COMPETITIVE	\$727,710	3		
GAMALIEL AMOROS GONZALEZ Total		\$727,710	3	0.1%	73.3%
ENRIQUE GARCIA	COMPETITIVE	\$504,430	2		
	COMPETITIVE - SIMPLIFIED PURCHASE	\$204,456	1		
ENRIQUE GARCIA Total		\$708,886	3	0.1%	73.4%

Supplier Name	Competitive Classification	Sum of Committed \$	Contract Actions	% of Total	Cumulative %
ANDREWS DELIVERY SERVICE INC	COMPETITIVE	\$688,385	1		
ANDREWS DELIVERY SERVICE INC Total		\$688,385	1	0.1%	73.5%
WALTER THIGPEN	COMPETITIVE	\$687,878	1		
WALTER THIGPEN Total		\$687,878	1	0.1%	73.7%
METHOD FREIGHT INC	COMPETITIVE - SIMPLIFIED PURCHASE	\$681,534	1		
METHOD FREIGHT INC Total		\$681,534	1	0.1%	73.8%
DONALD E KRAUS TRUCKING	COMPETITIVE	\$679,030	1		
DONALD E KRAUS TRUCKING Total		\$679,030	1	0.1%	73.9%
SADLER BROS TRUCKING & LEASING CO INC	COMPETITIVE	\$671,410	6		
SADLER BROS TRUCKING & LEASING CO INC Total		\$671,410	6	0.1%	74.0%
CHRISTIAN D GOHN	COMPETITIVE	\$651,595	2		
CHRISTIAN D GOHN Total		\$651,595	2	0.1%	74.2%
JKS TRUCKING LLC	COMPETITIVE	\$646,005	1		
JKS TRUCKING LLC Total		\$646,005	1	0.1%	74.3%
HARTWIG TRANSIT INC	COMPETITIVE	\$637,465	9		
HARTWIG TRANSIT INC Total		\$637,465	9	0.1%	74.4%
BOYLES POSTAL SERV INC	COMPETITIVE	\$637,037	1		
BOYLES POSTAL SERV INC Total		\$637,037	1	0.1%	74.5%
KATHLEEN HARVEY	COMPETITIVE	\$634,040	2		
KATHLEEN HARVEY Total		\$634,040	2	0.1%	74.6%
TENNA LEE BREWER	COMPETITIVE	\$624,959	2		
TENNA LEE BREWER Total		\$624,959	2	0.1%	74.7%
BEAR EXPRESS TRNSP INC	COMPETITIVE	\$624,449	4		
BEAR EXPRESS TRNSP INC Total		\$624,449	4	0.1%	74.8%
MACIAS LLAMAS INC	COMPETITIVE	\$619,054	1		
MACIAS LLAMAS INC Total		\$619,054	1	0.1%	75.0%
JOHN R MOTT INC	COMPETITIVE	\$568,510	1		
	NONCOMPETITIVE - COMPELLING BUSINESS INTERESTS	\$44,991	1		
JOHN R MOTT INC Total		\$613,501	2	0.1%	75.1%
SAMUEL D CARBO JR	COMPETITIVE	\$612,502	1		
SAMUEL D CARBO JR Total		\$612,502	1	0.1%	75.2%
JAMES ALVIN TURNER	COMPETITIVE	\$610,448	2		
JAMES ALVIN TURNER Total		\$610,448	2	0.1%	75.3%
JOHN D EKSTED	COMPETITIVE - SIMPLIFIED PURCHASE	\$603,492	2		
JOHN D EKSTED Total		\$603,492	2	0.1%	75.4%
MRF SALES & LEASING INC	COMPETITIVE	\$590,707	1		
MRF SALES & LEASING INC Total		\$590,707	1	0.1%	75.5%
RED DIAMOND TRUCKING CO INC	COMPETITIVE	\$587,339	3		
RED DIAMOND TRUCKING CO INC Total		\$587,339	3	0.1%	75.6%
MEMIKI INC	COMPETITIVE	\$586,603	3		
MEMIKI INC Total		\$586,603	3	0.1%	75.7%
REMY MALIWANAG RODRIGUEZ	COMPETITIVE	\$578,195	2		
REMY MALIWANAG RODRIGUEZ Total		\$578,195	2	0.1%	75.8%
JESSICA MYRIA TIPTON	COMPETITIVE	\$567,393	1		
JESSICA MYRIA TIPTON Total		\$567,393	1	0.1%	75.9%
UNITRAN INC	COMPETITIVE	\$565,303	1		
UNITRAN INC Total		\$565,303	1	0.1%	76.0%
W E ENTERPRISES INC	COMPETITIVE	\$563,260	1		
W E ENTERPRISES INC Total		\$563,260	1	0.1%	76.1%
MELANIE MARGARET CONRADT	COMPETITIVE	\$557,188	3		
MELANIE MARGARET CONRADT Total		\$557,188	3	0.1%	76.2%

Supplier Name	Competitive Classification	Sum of Committed \$	Contract Actions	% of Total	Cumulative %
FAGAN TRANSPORTATION	COMPETITIVE	\$554,747	1		
FAGAN TRANSPORTATION Total		\$554,747	1	0.1%	76.3%
OKEIGH TRANS CO	COMPETITIVE	\$552,070	1		
OKEIGH TRANS CO Total		\$552,070	1	0.1%	76.4%
MISTI'S TRANSPORT INC	COMPETITIVE - SIMPLIFIED PURCHASE	\$547,372	2		
MISTI'S TRANSPORT INC Total		\$547,372	2	0.1%	76.5%
DAN RIHNER	COMPETITIVE	\$533,619	1		
DAN RIHNER Total		\$533,619	1	0.1%	76.6%
JAYNE CAMPBELL	COMPETITIVE	\$533,385	2		
JAYNE CAMPBELL Total		\$533,385	2	0.1%	76.7%
RAFAEL GUILVERMO ALVARADO	COMPETITIVE	\$525,943	1		
RAFAEL GUILVERMO ALVARADO Total		\$525,943	1	0.1%	76.8%
WOS INC	COMPETITIVE	\$524,791	1		
WOS INC Total		\$524,791	1	0.1%	76.9%
WILCOX TRUCK LINE INC	COMPETITIVE	\$519,253	5		
WILCOX TRUCK LINE INC Total		\$519,253	5	0.1%	77.0%
BARBARA J SOJA-HARPER	COMPETITIVE	\$514,112	2		
BARBARA J SOJA-HARPER Total		\$514,112	2	0.1%	77.1%
R D EAGLE TRANSPORTS	COMPETITIVE	\$511,989	4		
R D EAGLE TRANSPORTS Total		\$511,989	4	0.1%	77.2%
BALDWIN CONTRACTING INC	COMPETITIVE	\$511,537	2		
BALDWIN CONTRACTING INC Total		\$511,537	2	0.1%	77.3%
PETRILLO TRUCKING INC	COMPETITIVE	\$508,382	1		
PETRILLO TRUCKING INC Total		\$508,382	1	0.1%	77.4%
L&S TRANSPORT LLC	COMPETITIVE	\$505,107	1		
L&S TRANSPORT LLC Total		\$505,107	1	0.1%	77.5%
LEHIGH VALLEY MAIL TRANSPORT, INC	COMPETITIVE	\$494,901	1		
LEHIGH VALLEY MAIL TRANSPORT, INC Total		\$494,901	1	0.1%	77.6%
GAYLE J SCHULTZ	COMPETITIVE	\$488,696	1		
GAYLE J SCHULTZ Total		\$488,696	1	0.1%	77.6%
C AND B TRUCKING INCORPORATED	COMPETITIVE	\$482,699	1		
C AND B TRUCKING INCORPORATED Total		\$482,699	1	0.1%	77.7%
ANAJ HOLDINGS, INC	COMPETITIVE	\$481,972	1		
ANAJ HOLDINGS, INC Total		\$481,972	1	0.1%	77.8%
DIANE C MATHIAS	COMPETITIVE	\$481,416	1		
DIANE C MATHIAS Total		\$481,416	1	0.1%	77.9%
PORTER USPS CONTRACTING LLC	COMPETITIVE	\$479,578	3		
PORTER USPS CONTRACTING LLC Total		\$479,578	3	0.1%	78.0%
ROTH TRUCKING INC	COMPETITIVE	\$479,330	5		
ROTH TRUCKING INC Total		\$479,330	5	0.1%	78.1%
SILVER STAR MAIL TRANSPORT INC	COMPETITIVE	\$475,251	1		
SILVER STAR MAIL TRANSPORT INC Total		\$475,251	1	0.1%	78.2%
NIEHAUS EXPRESS CORP	COMPETITIVE	\$473,108	1		
NIEHAUS EXPRESS CORP Total		\$473,108	1	0.1%	78.3%
MICHELLE BURGER-SORENSEN	COMPETITIVE	\$344,806	1		
	COMPETITIVE - SIMPLIFIED PURCHASE	\$123,434	1		
MICHELLE BURGER-SORENSEN Total		\$468,240	2	0.1%	78.3%
SUE L YOUNG	COMPETITIVE - SIMPLIFIED PURCHASE	\$453,608	1		
	NONCOMPETITIVE - SOLE PURCHASE	\$11,135	1		
SUE L YOUNG Total		\$464,743	2	0.1%	78.4%
WILLIAM ARTHUR DUNN	COMPETITIVE - SIMPLIFIED PURCHASE	\$459,741	1		
WILLIAM ARTHUR DUNN Total		\$459,741	1	0.1%	78.5%

Supplier Name	Competitive Classification	Sum of Committed \$	Contract Actions	% of Total	Cumulative %
LEROY WEITMAN	COMPETITIVE - SIMPLIFIED PURCHASE	\$458,768	1		
LEROY WEITMAN Total		\$458,768	1	0.1%	78.6%
DARK ENTERPRISE	COMPETITIVE	\$454,963	1		
DARK ENTERPRISE Total		\$454,963	1	0.1%	78.7%
C H ROBINSON CO	COMPETITIVE	\$449,442	5		
C H ROBINSON CO Total		\$449,442	5	0.1%	78.8%
JEFFREY WAYNE MOELLER	COMPETITIVE	\$442,080	3		
JEFFREY WAYNE MOELLER Total		\$442,080	3	0.1%	78.8%
BREWER & SONS	COMPETITIVE	\$439,627	1		
BREWER & SONS Total		\$439,627	1	0.1%	78.9%
M HANDY TRANSPORT INC	COMPETITIVE	\$439,219	1		
M HANDY TRANSPORT INC Total		\$439,219	1	0.1%	79.0%
EFFICIENT TRANSPORTERS LLC	COMPETITIVE	\$438,455	1		
EFFICIENT TRANSPORTERS LLC Total		\$438,455	1	0.1%	79.1%
JAMES R PATRON	COMPETITIVE	\$437,887	2		
JAMES R PATRON Total		\$437,887	2	0.1%	79.2%
VIRGINIA C BALDWIN	COMPETITIVE	\$432,505	1		
VIRGINIA C BALDWIN Total		\$432,505	1	0.1%	79.2%
JEROME GIFTS	COMPETITIVE	\$430,873	2		
JEROME GIFTS Total		\$430,873	2	0.1%	79.3%
ROBIN L YOUNG	COMPETITIVE	\$426,552	1		
ROBIN L YOUNG Total		\$426,552	1	0.1%	79.4%
GWAYBO TRANSPORT LLC	COMPETITIVE	\$426,376	1		
GWAYBO TRANSPORT LLC Total		\$426,376	1	0.1%	79.5%
ERIC JAMES SUMMERS	COMPETITIVE	\$425,709	1		
ERIC JAMES SUMMERS Total		\$425,709	1	0.1%	79.5%
CBASS RESOURCES LLC	COMPETITIVE	\$424,896	1		
CBASS RESOURCES LLC Total		\$424,896	1	0.1%	79.6%
MAIL DELIVERY SERVICES, INC	COMPETITIVE	\$422,848	1		
MAIL DELIVERY SERVICES, INC Total		\$422,848	1	0.1%	79.7%
KLIZOTTE CONTRACTORS	COMPETITIVE	\$422,614	1		
KLIZOTTE CONTRACTORS Total		\$422,614	1	0.1%	79.8%
TROJAN HORSE LIMITED	NONCOMPETITIVE - COMPELLING BUSINESS INTERESTS	\$351,475	4		
	COMPETITIVE	\$67,178	1		
TROJAN HORSE LIMITED Total		\$418,653	5	0.1%	79.9%
CASTLE RUN LLC	COMPETITIVE	\$417,692	1		
CASTLE RUN LLC Total		\$417,692	1	0.1%	79.9%
JANIS L PRATER	COMPETITIVE	\$417,265	1		
JANIS L PRATER Total		\$417,265	1	0.1%	80.0%

Appendix E.

Contract Commitments and Competitive Classifications for eFMS - 80 Percent of Total Commitment Dollars

From October 1, 2012, to September 30, 2013, there were a total of 1,269 contract actions equal to or above the competitive threshold (\$10K) executed in eFMS with commitments totaling \$318.8M. The following table highlights the top 80 percent of supplier commitments based on commitment totals.

Supplier Name	Competitive Classification	Sum of Committed \$	Contract Actions	% of Total	Cumulative %
ROTH BROS INC	Competitive	\$45,102,346	346		
ROTH BROS INC Total		\$45,102,346	346	14.1%	14.1%
KORTE CONSTRUCTION CO	Competitive	\$43,130,404	1		
KORTE CONSTRUCTION CO Total		\$43,130,404	1	13.5%	27.7%
SIMON ROOFING & SHEET METAL CORP	Competitive	\$14,174,219	113		
SIMON ROOFING & SHEET METAL CORP Total		\$14,174,219	113	4.4%	32.1%
PARSONS CORPORATION	Competitive	\$8,449,552	71		
PARSONS CORPORATION Total		\$8,449,552	71	2.6%	34.8%
LIGHTON INDUSTRIES INC	Competitive	\$7,979,092	11		
LIGHTON INDUSTRIES INC Total		\$7,979,092	11	2.5%	37.3%
OSTROW ELECTRICAL CO INC	Competitive	\$7,749,000	1		
OSTROW ELECTRICAL CO INC Total		\$7,749,000	1	2.4%	39.7%
KELLEY BROTHERS ROOFING INC	Competitive	\$7,701,909	2		
KELLEY BROTHERS ROOFING INC Total		\$7,701,909	2	2.4%	42.1%
BARSTO CONSTRUCTION INC	Competitive	\$7,653,581	2		
BARSTO CONSTRUCTION INC Total		\$7,653,581	2	2.4%	44.5%
SG CONSTRUCTION SERVICES INC	Competitive	\$7,305,486	24		
SG CONSTRUCTION SERVICES INC Total		\$7,305,486	24	2.3%	46.8%
BIG D CONSTRUCTION CORP	Competitive	\$6,924,192	1		
BIG D CONSTRUCTION CORP Total		\$6,924,192	1	2.2%	49.0%
J E NOVACK CONSTRUCTION CO	Competitive	\$5,635,153	17		
J E NOVACK CONSTRUCTION CO Total		\$5,635,153	17	1.8%	50.7%
SIEDLECKI CONSTRUCTION CO	Competitive	\$4,887,018	3		
SIEDLECKI CONSTRUCTION CO Total		\$4,887,018	3	1.5%	52.3%
THE WHITING-TURNER CONTR CO	Competitive	\$4,562,391	1		
THE WHITING-TURNER CONTR CO Total		\$4,562,391	1	1.4%	53.7%
AGENCY CONSTRUCTION CORP	Competitive	\$4,436,743	6		
AGENCY CONSTRUCTION CORP Total		\$4,436,743	6	1.4%	55.1%
PEACHTREE MECHANICAL INC	Competitive	\$4,341,790	2		
PEACHTREE MECHANICAL INC Total		\$4,341,790	2	1.4%	56.5%
INLAND CONSTRUCTION	Competitive	\$3,918,549	2		
INLAND CONSTRUCTION Total		\$3,918,549	2	1.2%	57.7%
COMMONWEALTH ELECTRIC CO	Competitive	\$3,906,227	1		
COMMONWEALTH ELECTRIC CO Total		\$3,906,227	1	1.2%	58.9%
THYSSENKRUPP ELEVATOR CORPORATION	Competitive	\$3,839,480	1		
THYSSENKRUPP ELEVATOR CORPORATION Total		\$3,839,480	1	1.2%	60.1%
PAUL J ROGAN CO INC	Competitive	\$3,666,312	4		
PAUL J ROGAN CO INC Total		\$3,666,312	4	1.1%	61.3%
URS GROUP	Competitive	\$3,584,602	49		
URS GROUP Total		\$3,584,602	49	1.1%	62.4%
NATIONAL ELEVATOR INSPECTION SERVICES I	Competitive	\$3,425,060	30		
NATIONAL ELEVATOR INSPECTION SERVICES I Total		\$3,425,060	30	1.1%	63.5%

Supplier Name	Competitive Classification	Sum of Committed \$	Contract Actions	% of Total	Cumulative %
LINDSETH CONSTRUCTION	Competitive	\$3,274,776	1		
LINDSETH CONSTRUCTION Total		\$3,274,776	1	1.0%	64.5%
KNIGHTSBRIDGE CORP	Competitive	\$3,170,000	1		
KNIGHTSBRIDGE CORP Total		\$3,170,000	1	1.0%	65.5%
CHARTER CONSTRUCTION COMPANY	Competitive	\$3,122,594	13		
	Unauthorized Commitment	\$24,999	1		
CHARTER CONSTRUCTION COMPANY Total		\$3,147,593	14	1.0%	66.5%
KONE INC	Competitive	\$2,988,464	1		
KONE INC Total		\$2,988,464	1	0.9%	67.4%
D A EDWARDS & CO	Competitive	\$2,801,689	39		
	Competitive - Simplified Purchasing	\$184,354	1		
D A EDWARDS & CO Total		\$2,986,043	40	0.9%	68.3%
VARIETY CONTRACTORS INC	Competitive	\$2,455,000	2		
	Competitive - Simplified Purchasing	\$399,029	2		
VARIETY CONTRACTORS INC Total		\$2,854,029	4	0.9%	69.2%
GARCO CONSTRUCTION INC	Competitive	\$2,627,608	1		
GARCO CONSTRUCTION INC Total		\$2,627,608	1	0.8%	70.1%
PENNINGTON PLUMBING	Competitive	\$2,602,541	1		
PENNINGTON PLUMBING Total		\$2,602,541	1	0.8%	70.9%
LIMBACH COMPANY LLC	Competitive	\$2,497,000	1		
LIMBACH COMPANY LLC Total		\$2,497,000	1	0.8%	71.7%
BURCHICK CONSTR CO INC	Competitive	\$2,390,421	1		
BURCHICK CONSTR CO INC Total		\$2,390,421	1	0.7%	72.4%
J J MORLEY ENTERPRISES INC	Competitive	\$2,168,699	11		
	Competitive - Simplified Purchasing	\$207,700	1		
J J MORLEY ENTERPRISES INC Total		\$2,376,399	12	0.7%	73.2%
THE ALEXANDER GROUP LLC	Competitive	\$1,518,193	2		
	Competitive - Simplified Purchasing	\$843,270	1		
THE ALEXANDER GROUP LLC Total		\$2,361,463	3	0.7%	73.9%
WEATHERPROOFING TECHNOLOGIES	Competitive	\$2,303,686	44		
WEATHERPROOFING TECHNOLOGIES Total		\$2,303,686	44	0.7%	74.6%
ALL-TEX ROOFING, INC.	Competitive	\$2,244,700	7		
ALL-TEX ROOFING, INC. Total		\$2,244,700	7	0.7%	75.3%
JOLLY ROOFING & CONTRACTING	Competitive	\$1,702,020	7		
	Competitive - Simplified Purchasing	\$508,325	3		
JOLLY ROOFING & CONTRACTING Total		\$2,210,345	10	0.7%	76.0%
BASIC IDIQ INC	Competitive	\$1,929,645	5		
	Competitive - Simplified Purchasing	\$261,500	1		
BASIC IDIQ INC Total		\$2,191,145	6	0.7%	76.7%
WELLINGTON POWER CORP	Competitive	\$2,097,824	1		
WELLINGTON POWER CORP Total		\$2,097,824	1	0.7%	77.4%
MILL CITY CONSTRUCTION	Competitive	\$2,065,999	5		
MILL CITY CONSTRUCTION Total		\$2,065,999	5	0.6%	78.0%
TARHEEL ROOFING	Competitive	\$2,028,449	5		
TARHEEL ROOFING Total		\$2,028,449	5	0.6%	78.6%
MORCON CONSTRUCTION CO INC.	Competitive	\$1,980,326	3		
	Competitive - Simplified Purchasing	\$12,721	1		
MORCON CONSTRUCTION CO INC. Total		\$1,993,047	4	0.6%	79.3%
AZTEC CONSULTANTS	Competitive	\$1,908,618	2		
AZTEC CONSULTANTS Total		\$1,908,618	2	0.6%	79.9%
L D DOCSA ASSOCIATES INC	Competitive	\$1,775,755	2		
L D DOCSA ASSOCIATES INC Total		\$1,775,755	2	0.6%	80.4%

Appendix F.

Contract Commitments and Competitive Classifications from FPDS-NG Competition Advocate Report

The Federal Procurement Data System (FPDS-NG) captures and reports summary level contract actions and commitment information for agencies using appropriated funds as specified in FAR 4.6. The CA report within FPDS-NG from October 1, 2012, to September 30, 2013, contains contract actions for 64 departments totaling \$460.8B in contractual commitments. The following table provides the total actions, commitments, competed actions, % competed actions, competed commitments and % competed commitments for the departments listed in the report.

Federal Procurement Data System (FPDS) For the period: October 1, 2012-September 30, 2013

Department	Total Actions	Total Dollars	Competed Actions	% Competed of Actions	Competed Dollars	% Competed Dollars
LIBRARY OF CONGRESS (0300)	38	\$0	38	100.0%	\$0	0.0000%
GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE (0500)	550	\$59,050,528	428	77.8%	\$47,268,725	80.0%
EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT (1100)	773	\$61,757,540	448	58.0%	\$38,290,358	62.0%
PEACE CORPS(1145)	353	\$99,629,282	262	74.2%	\$94,801,912	95.2%
UNITED STATES TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT AGENCY (1153)	32	\$2,940,898	26	81.3%	\$2,052,514	69.8%
AGRICULTURE, DEPARTMENT OF (1200)	65,866	\$5,011,349,546	48,139	73.1%	\$4,314,427,917	86.1%
COMMERCE, DEPARTMENT OF (1300)	28,566	\$2,302,720,274	21,556	75.5%	\$1,780,715,319	77.3%
INTERIOR, DEPARTMENT OF THE (1400)	68,888	\$3,690,049,166	48,747	70.8%	\$2,859,899,745	77.5%
JUSTICE, DEPARTMENT OF (1500)	153,771	\$7,143,740,749	111,023	72.2%	\$5,410,414,389	75.7%
LABOR, DEPARTMENT OF (1600)	8,558	\$1,955,459,344	5,107	59.7%	\$1,553,288,665	79.4%
PENSION BENEFIT GUARANTY CORPORATION (1665)	1,525	\$250,948,855	997	65.4%	\$215,689,578	85.9%
STATE, DEPARTMENT OF (1900)	86,607	\$7,371,372,031	64,220	74.2%	\$5,817,334,272	78.9%
INTERNATIONAL BOUNDARY AND WATER COMMISSION: U.S.-MEXICO (19BM)	576	\$40,124,040	369	64.1%	\$34,000,752	84.7%
TREASURY, DEPARTMENT OF THE (2000)	31,145	\$6,871,108,527	17,594	56.5%	\$5,895,475,569	85.8%
OFFICE OF PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT (2400)	4,958	\$1,092,142,679	3,535	71.3%	\$817,996,447	74.9%
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION (2700)	500	\$89,627,026	373	74.6%	\$80,763,143	90.1%
SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION (2800)	13,851	\$1,334,623,003	5,345	38.6%	\$781,538,721	58.6%
FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION (2900)	881	\$63,688,774	338	38.4%	\$45,614,650	71.6%
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION (3100)	3,023	\$209,292,869	1,745	57.7%	\$157,112,344	75.1%
SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION (3300)	3,117	\$363,711,166	1,110	35.6%	\$288,459,839	79.3%
J. F. KENNEDY CENTER FOR THE PERFORMING ARTS (3352)	169	\$15,858,296	127	75.1%	\$12,320,564	77.7%
NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART (3355)	376	\$15,809,971	261	69.4%	\$11,918,700	75.4%
INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION (3400)	279	\$10,485,764	135	48.4%	\$7,024,123	67.0%
VETERANS AFFAIRS, DEPARTMENT OF (3600)	1,732,509	\$18,213,618,067	1,563,653	90.3%	\$14,626,515,002	80.3%
MERIT SYSTEMS PROTECTION BOARD (4100)	299	\$5,610,878	294	98.3%	\$5,522,947	98.4%
EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION (4500)	2,237	\$44,912,307	1,043	46.6%	\$14,134,544	31.5%
GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION (4700)	165,939	\$8,541,795,291	141,140	85.1%	\$6,817,076,560	79.8%
NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION (4900)	872	\$437,294,916	543	62.3%	\$399,229,952	91.3%
SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION (5000)	2,389	\$276,473,768	1,330	55.7%	\$215,824,145	78.1%
FEDERAL LABOR RELATIONS AUTHORITY (5400)	35	\$1,132,990	7	20.0%	\$344,616	30.4%
NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES (5900)	65	\$2,540,384	40	61.5%	\$2,265,786	89.2%
NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE ARTS (5920)	50	\$1,304,294	37	74.0%	\$1,079,591	82.8%
NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE HUMANITIES (5940)	131	\$5,303,277	54	41.2%	\$802,665	15.1%
RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD (6000)	243	\$26,269,896	135	55.6%	\$23,231,164	88.4%
CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY COMMISSION (6100)	741	\$22,872,564	221	29.8%	\$10,579,508	46.3%

Department	Total Actions	Total Dollars	Completed Actions	% Completed of Actions	Completed Dollars	% Completed Dollars
NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD (6300)	285	\$13,869,376	227	79.6%	\$11,099,703	80.0%
FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION (6500)	72	\$756,191	38	52.8%	\$458,179	60.6%
ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY (6800)	19,661	\$1,422,607,097	13,954	71.0%	\$1,180,085,421	83.0%
TRANSPORTATION, DEPARTMENT OF (6900)	23,036	\$6,089,067,751	16,284	70.7%	\$5,082,932,510	83.5%
HOMELAND SECURITY, DEPARTMENT OF (7000)	82,185	\$12,204,018,432	56,679	69.0%	\$8,601,651,069	70.5%
OVERSEAS PRIVATE INVESTMENT CORPORATION (7100)	192	\$15,840,169	131	68.2%	\$7,604,122	48.0%
AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT (7200)	9,758	\$4,382,904,705	7,425	76.1%	\$3,082,770,311	70.3%
SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION (7300)	989	\$92,775,381	632	63.9%	\$52,806,432	56.9%
HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, DEPARTMENT OF (7500)	88,199	\$19,943,580,645	53,006	60.1%	\$16,117,438,901	80.8%
NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION (8000)	32,107	\$14,214,288,095	21,276	66.3%	\$9,257,401,936	65.1%
HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, DEPARTMENT OF (8600)	3,175	\$1,587,131,408	1,605	50.6%	\$1,302,771,815	82.1%
NATIONAL ARCHIVES AND RECORDS ADMINISTRATION (8800)	1,431	\$170,951,339	955	66.7%	\$122,088,536	71.4%
ENERGY, DEPARTMENT OF (8900)	12,709	\$23,947,540,876	7,944	62.5%	\$21,582,980,401	90.1%
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION (8961)	548	\$45,264,762	338	61.7%	\$36,818,408	81.3%
SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM (9000)	15	\$271,394	1	6.7%	\$26,480	9.8%
EDUCATION, DEPARTMENT OF (9100)	3,258	\$2,621,095,782	2,357	72.3%	\$2,332,674,909	89.0%
FEDERAL MEDIATION AND CONCILIATION SERVICE (9300)	82	\$1,633,741	55	67.1%	\$1,143,114	70.0%
NATIONAL CAPITAL PLANNING COMMISSION (9502)	4	\$39,204	2	50.0%	\$19,508	49.8%
FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION (9506)	217	\$9,976,458	123	56.7%	\$6,657,246	66.7%
COMMODITY FUTURES TRADING COMMISSION (9507)	611	\$44,360,513	409	66.9%	\$38,760,863	87.4%
NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD (9508)	243	\$10,025,126	179	73.7%	\$8,086,134	80.7%
DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD (9516)	63	\$2,450,743	28	44.4%	\$554,274	22.6%
NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD (9524)	173	\$1,343,509	173	100.0%	\$1,343,509	100.0%
MILLENNIUM CHALLENGE CORPORATION (9543)	615	\$62,751,685	531	86.3%	\$58,914,070	93.9%
CONSUMER FINANCIAL PROTECTION BUREAU (955F)	431	\$47,046,546	352	81.7%	\$40,994,125	87.1%
CHEMICAL SAFETY AND HAZARD INVESTIGATION BOARD (9565)	126	\$1,804,362	55	43.7%	\$638,524	35.4%
BROADCASTING BOARD OF GOVERNORS (9568)	9,996	\$140,486,043	8,439	84.4%	\$88,860,657	63.3%
CORPORATION FOR NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE (9577)	1,038	\$65,070,442	840	80.9%	\$52,909,013	81.3%
COURT SERVICES AND OFFENDER SUPERVISION AGENCY (9594)	533	\$25,804,615	326	61.2%	\$20,407,950	79.1%
DEPT OF DEFENSE (9700)	10,965,719	\$308,022,634,663	10,596,803	96.6%	\$174,554,659,543	56.7%
Total	13,637,383	\$460,822,010,014	12,831,587	94.1%	\$296,028,572,388	64.2%
Excluding DoD	2,671,664	\$152,799,375,351	2,234,784	83.6%	\$121,473,912,844	79.5%

Appendix G.

Noncompetitive Purchases – Management Instruction (SP S2-2011-1)

In addition to the SPs and Ps, the noncompetitive purchase management instruction (MI) outlines the noncompetitive process. The MI is available internally on the Postal Service Intranet site: <http://blue.usps.gov/cpim/ftp/manage/sps2111.pdf>.

The MI is attached for external readers who do not have access to the Postal Service Intranet site



Management Instruction

Noncompetitive Purchases

This management instruction (MI) provides guidance to individuals involved in the purchase process, including the contracting officer and the requesting organization [purchase/supply chain management (SCM) team] on whether to purchase goods or services competitively or noncompetitively. This MI also establishes procedures for developing and evaluating a Noncompetitive Purchase Request (NPR) and for securing recommendations, endorsements, and approvals of such requests.

Scope

The following procedures apply to all noncompetitive purchases of supplies, services, and equipment; design, construction, and related services; and mail transportation and related services, except for purchases valued at less than \$10,000; such purchases may be made without following the processes contained in this MI. Information about noncompetitive purchases of real estate and related services is provided in Handbook RE-1, *Postal Service Facilities Guide to Real Property Acquisitions and Related Services*. See *Orders Against Ordering Agreements and Indefinite Delivery/Quantity Contracts* below for information on those subjects.

Purchase Method

As early as possible, the requesting organization should contact the relevant purchasing organization to discuss upcoming requirements and how they should be met. Topics to be addressed include market conditions, potential sourcing strategies, and purchase methods. In most cases, the competitive purchase method is best suited to meet the business objectives of the Postal Service™. Competition brings market forces to bear and allows comparisons of the relative value of competing proposals and prices. However, there are business situations in which the noncompetitive purchase method better suits the Postal Service's business objectives. Determining the appropriate purchase method is part of purchase planning and is discussed in 2-1, Develop Purchase Plan, and 2-10, Determine Extent of Competition, of the *Postal Service's Supplying Principles and Practices* (SPs and Ps). Whether the noncompetitive purchase method is the most effective business practice will depend on the particular purchase. As discussed in the SPs and Ps, four general business scenarios represent instances in which the noncompetitive method may best suit Postal Service

Date February 7, 2011
Effective February 7, 2011
Number SP S2-2011-1
Obsoletes SP S2-2010-1
Unit Supply Management

Susan M. Brownell
Vice President
Supply Management

CONTENTS

Scope	1
Purchase Method	1
Preliminary Purchase Method Recommendation	2
Noncompetitive Purchase Request	2
Competition Advocate Review and Advice	3
Contracting Officer Evaluation	3
Collaboration	4
Purchase Method Approval Authorities	4
Purchase Plans	4
Orders Against Ordering Agreements and Indefinite Delivery/Quantity Contracts	5
Modifications	5
Documentation	5
Emergencies	5
Attachment	5
Noncompetitive Purchase Request	5
ATTACHMENT	
Noncompetitive Purchase Request (Required)	6

business objectives and therefore prove the most effective. The four scenarios are described below.

1. **Sole Source.** Only one supplier exists who is capable of satisfying a requirement.
2. **Industry Structure or Practice.** The industry producing or supplying the required goods or services is structured in a manner that renders competition ineffective; for example, when purchasing goods or services that are regulated, such as some utilities, or when purchasing from nonprofit or educational institutions that do not compete in the marketplace.
3. **Compelling Business Interests.** There is a business interest that is so compelling that purchasing noncompetitively outweighs the benefits of competition. These situations can include, but are not limited to, the urgency of the requirement, a supplier innovation that furthers Postal Service business objectives, or undue cost or delay would result from a contract award to a new supplier.
4. **Superior Performance.** A supplier's superior performance and its contributions to the Postal Service's business and competitive objectives merit award of a particular purchase. For example, extending the term or expanding the scope of a contract for substantially the same or similar goods or services when a supplier has performed at such a high level that the extension or expansion is well-deserved, or when a supplier's superior performance has made such performance beneficial to Postal Service operations.

Preliminary Purchase Method Recommendation

The purchase/SCM team must make a preliminary purchase method recommendation as to whether the purchase should be made competitively or noncompetitively. This should occur in the purchase planning phase, or if applicable, prior to the completion of the Justification of Expenditure or the Decision Analysis Report. The relevant purchasing organization will assist in conducting market research and provide any other needed expertise. If a recommendation is made to obtain goods or services noncompetitively, the requesting organization must develop a NPR, providing accurate and complete data in support of its request.

Noncompetitive Purchase Request

The requesting organization must submit the NPR to the contracting officer. If the estimated value of the purchase is \$1 million or more, then the contracting officer will forward a copy of the NPR to the Postal Service's Competition Advocate (CA) for that individual's review. The NPR must include the business scenario and rationale for the noncompetitive purchase. While the extent and detail of the request will depend on the particular purchase, its complexity, and its potential

dollar value, the following must be addressed in all cases (see the attachment to this MI for more detail):

1. Purpose — Purpose of the purchase.
2. Background — Past purchases, summary of contract for modifications, etc.
3. Scenarios/basis (Include only those that apply):
 - a. Sole source.
 - b. Industry structure or practice.
 - c. Compelling business interests.
 - d. Superior performance.
4. Market research — Other firms or products/services evaluated.
5. Company identity and history — Type of organization, prior customers, etc.
6. Estimated cost — Estimated cost.
7. Future Purchases — Plans for future competition.
8. Conflicts of interest or appearance of the loss of impartiality in the performance of official duties certification and nondisclosure statement:
 - A certification that the requestor(s) does not have a financial interest in any entity or party interested in the purchase that would give rise to a criminal financial conflict of interest (see 18 USC § 208) or a personal or business relationship that could lead a reasonable person with the relevant facts to question the requestor's ability to remain impartial in the selection process (see 5 CFR 2635.502 of the Standards of Ethical Conduct for Employees of the Executive Branch) and
 - A statement that the requestor(s) will not disclose any sensitive information during the purchasing process.
9. Required signatures of the requesting organization — The Noncompetitive Purchase Request must be signed by:
 - a. Its originator/preparer.
 - b. All responsible manager(s) in the requesting office's management chain.
 - c. Vice president of the requesting office if the estimated value of the noncompetitive purchase is expected to exceed \$250,000.

Competition Advocate Review and Advice

The CA is responsible for completing an independent review of the NPR for purchases valued at \$1 million or more. The CA provides independent advice for the contracting officer to consider in his or her evaluation and recommendation on the NPR. See SPs and Ps 2-10.3.4, Competition Advocate, for more information on the CA's responsibilities.

Contracting Officer Evaluation

The contracting officer must review the NPR and perform a written evaluation of the proposed supplier's past performance and supplier

capability and any other matter he or she believes will lead to a more informed and effective purchase decision. In addition, the contracting officer must consider the advice provided by the CA, if applicable. The contracting officer must document his or her approval or disapproval if within his or her delegated authority, or forward his or her recommendation through the management chain to the appropriate approval authority. The contracting officer's approval of the NPR does not constitute approval of contract award. The contracting officer is required to negotiate reasonable pricing and terms and conditions prior to contract award, including review of relevant competitive pricing, when applicable, and a determination that the contract price is fair and reasonable.

Collaboration

If the parties disagree as to purchase method, they should collaborate in order for the final purchase method determination or recommendation to be made. This collaboration will provide the requesting organization with the opportunity to bring forth any new or changed information which may affect the opinions of the contracting officer and approval authority (if applicable). The CA may assist in these deliberations.

Purchase Method Approval Authorities

The managers of the Facilities, Mail Equipment, Services, Supplies, and Transportation Portfolios within Supply Management may approve purchase method recommendations for noncompetitive purchase valued up to \$10 million, except for noncompetitive purchases of professional, technical, and consultant services valued at \$1 million or more. Purchase method recommendations for noncompetitive purchases of professional, technical, and consultant services valued at \$1 million or more and all other noncompetitive purchases valued at \$10 million or more must be reviewed and approved by the Vice President, Supply Management. Portfolio managers may delegate up to \$250,000 of their purchase method approval authority to subordinate Team Leaders or managers in the applicable purchasing organization. The appropriate authority's approval of the noncompetitive purchase method does not constitute approval of contract award. The contracting officer is required to negotiate reasonable pricing and terms and conditions prior to contract award, including a review of relevant competitive pricing, when applicable, and a determination that the contract price is fair and reasonable.

Purchase Plans

Purchase plans are required for purchases (competitive and noncompetitive) valued at \$1 million or more. For noncompetitive purchases, the purchase plan must be drawn up by the contracting officer after the noncompetitive purchase method has been approved by the appropriate authority (see SPs and Ps 2-1, Develop Purchase Plan, for more information).

Orders Against Ordering Agreements and Indefinite Delivery/Quantity Contracts

Orders against ordering agreements valued at \$10,000 or more must be competed or treated as a noncompetitive purchase subject to this MI and the SPs and Ps. Orders against competitively awarded indefinite delivery/quantity (IDIQ) contracts are considered competitive, but may be competed further among other IDIQ providers if in the best interests of the Postal Service. Orders against noncompetitively awarded IDIQs are considered noncompetitive, but only the original contract is subject to the noncompetitive procedures described in this MI and the SPs and Ps. See SPs and Ps 2-18, Select Contract Type, and 4-1, Ordering, for more information.

Modifications

Certain contract modifications may be subject to the noncompetitive processes detailed in this MI. See SPs and Ps, 5-8.8, Change Orders, for more information.

Documentation

The CO must ensure that all necessary documentation (NPR, CA advice, contracting officer evaluation and recommendation, price determinations, etc.) is included in the contract file. See SPs and Ps 2-40.3.2, Contract Files for Noncompetitive Contracts, for a complete list of necessary documentation.

Emergencies

When emergency conditions directly affect the safety or well-being of Postal Service personnel or may stop or seriously impede Postal Service operations, a contracting officer may approve an oral request for a noncompetitive purchase within his or her delegated noncompetitive approval authority. The requesting organization must follow up by addressing the appropriate elements of the Noncompetitive Purchase Request and sending it to the contracting officer. The contracting officer must include the Noncompetitive Purchase Request in the contract file.

Attachment

Noncompetitive Purchase Request

All requesting organizations must use the attachment to this MI, the Noncompetitive Purchase Request, to obtain approval for proposed noncompetitive purchases. If approval is granted, the contracting officer must include a copy of the request along with evidence of its approval in the contract file.

ATTACHMENT

Noncompetitive Purchase Request (Required)

Instructions. The noncompetitive purchase request should cover each area listed below. It is to be completed by the requesting organization. The relevant purchasing organization should be contacted for assistance as necessary. The depth of coverage depends upon the purchase's dollar value, importance, potential long-term impact, etc. Additional topics may be added if necessary to support the request.

1. Purpose

What is the purpose of the purchase? What Postal Service need will be met? What will be the benefit to the Postal Service? Is the item for test and evaluation or for functional or operational use? If for test and evaluation, what is the plan for purchase of additional quantities if the tests are successful?

2. Background

Describe past purchases of the same or similar products/services. If a contract modification is contemplated, provide a summary of the contract value, modifications, and period of performance.

3. Basis (Include only those applicable to your situation)

- a. *Sole Source.* A single supplier is capable of satisfying a requirement.
- b. *Industry Structure or Practice.* This is when the industry producing or supplying the required goods or services is structured in a manner that renders competition ineffective; for example, when purchasing goods or services that are regulated, such as some utilities, or when purchasing from nonprofit or educational institutions that do not compete in the marketplace.
- c. *Compelling Business Interests.* There is a business interest that is so compelling that purchasing noncompetitively outweighs the benefits of competition. These situations can include, but are not limited to, the urgency of the requirement, a supplier innovation that furthers Postal Service business objectives, or undue cost or delay would result from a contract award to a new supplier.
- d. *Superior Performance.* A supplier's superior performance and its contributions to the Postal Service's business and competitive objectives merit award of a particular purchase. For example, extending the term or expanding the scope of a contract for substantially the same or similar goods or services when a supplier has performed at such a high level that the extension is well deserved, or when a supplier's superior performance has made such performance beneficial to Postal Service operations.

4. Market Research

List other firms or products/services evaluated. State why their approach or product does not satisfy the Postal Service's needs. What source/product list has been screened? Estimate number of companies/individuals with similar products/services. Is the recommended source a manufacturer or dealer? Is the product commercially available? How long has it been on the market? How did you learn about the product/service?

5. Company Identity and History

Briefly define the type of organization, prior customers and contracts, and whether it has previously contracted with the Postal Service.

6. Estimated Cost

What's the estimated cost of the items or service? Estimate ancillary costs, such as maintenance, as well as total contract cost. If computer software is to be purchased, estimate cost of maintenance, upgrading, etc. What type of licensing arrangement does the company require? Estimate savings to the Postal Service over useful life of the product or result of the service. If modification of the item is required, estimate the cost of modification. What is the impact upon the Postal Service if the request is not approved?

7. Future Purchases

Describe plans to develop competition for subsequent purchases. Is there a specification adequate for competition? If not, what is being done to develop one? Describe the plans and proposed timetable.

8. Certifications of No Financial Conflict of Interest or Appearance of the Loss of Impartiality in the Performance of Official Duties

I certify that I and those persons whose interests are imputed to me by law, do not have a financial interest in any entity or party interested in this purchase. This includes any party or entity involved in the award of the purchase and any of its competitors.

I understand that the financial interests of the following persons are imputed to me by law:

- a. My spouse.
- b. My minor children.
- c. My general partner in any non-Postal Service business.
- d. An organization or entity in which I serve as officer, director, trustee, general partner or employee and
- e. A person with whom I am negotiating for or have an arrangement concerning prospective employment.

I also certify that, to the best of my knowledge, this purchase is not likely to have a direct and predictable effect on the financial interests of a member of my household, and that I do not have a covered relationship with any party or entity interested in this purchase or with anyone that represents a party or entity interested in this purchase. I understand that I have a covered relationship with:

- a. A person, other than a prospective employer, with whom I have or seek a business, contractual or other financial relationship that involves other than a routine consumer transaction.
- b. A person who is a member of my household or a relative with whom I have a close personal relationship.
- c. A person for whom my spouse, my parent or dependent child is, to my knowledge, serving or seeking to serve as an officer, director, trustee, general partner, agent, attorney, consultant, contractor or employee.
- d. A person for whom I have, within the last year, served as an officer, director, trustee, general partner, agent, attorney, consultant, contractor or employee.
- e. An organization, other than a political party, in which I am an active participant.

I also certify that I am not aware of any other circumstances that I believe would cause a reasonable person with knowledge of the relevant facts to question my ability to remain impartial in this purchase.

I understand that if I have a financial conflict of interest related to this purchase, or my participation in this purchase that would lead a reasonable person with the relevant knowledge to question my ability to remain impartial, that I am disqualified from participating in this purchase. I also understand that I must immediately stop all work on this purchase and consult with ethics counsel to determine if I may continue to participate in this purchase.

Nondisclosure

I understand that I may not disclose any nonpublic information to any party interested in this purchase nor allow the use of nonpublic information by any party interested in this purchase. Nonpublic information is information that I have gained by reason of my Postal Service employment and that I know or reasonably should know has not been made available to the general public.

9. Required Signatures of the Requesting Organization

Originator/Preparer Date

Title

All responsible manager(s) in the requesting organization’s management chain.

_____ Name Date	_____ Name Date
_____ Title	_____ Title

Vice President* Date

*The vice president of the requiring organization must sign the request if the estimated cost of the purchase exceeds \$250,000.

Appendix H.

Contracting Data Definitions

For purposes of this report, the following contract-related data terms and definitions are provided as follows:

- **Contract Action:** a new contract, delivery order, task order, work order, modification to, or termination of a contract
- **Commitments:** funding that is added to a contract against which payments are made. Commitments may extend over multiple fiscal years and are equivalent to contract obligations as reported by other agencies in the Federal Procurement Data System (FPDS-NG). However, not all contracts have committed funds. Therefore, the total committed values of the contracts will be different than spend against contracts within a fiscal year. An example of a non-committed contract is an Indefinite Delivery/Indefinite Quantity (IDIQ) contract that has a contractual minimum but orders are placed via the Postal Service on-catalog ordering system (eBuy2); the spend will occur against the contract but there will be no contractual commitments above the minimums of the contract. Commitments also include de-commitments that may occur during the life of a contract due to a reduction in scope or at the end of a contract during the contract close-out process to remove committed funds not spent.
- **Non-Personnel Operating Expenses:** expenses reported in the Postal Service 10-K and consists of transportation and other expenses. The majority of the non-personnel operating expenses are based on “spend” (defined below) but also include some financial adjustments based on 10-K reporting standards. Capital spend within the year is reflected via depreciation over multiple years.
- **Spend:** payments to suppliers within a fiscal year. Spend may be for expense or capital purchases throughout the year. Spend may also be offset by credits from suppliers. This CA report does not classify spend into competitive or noncompetitive because spend may be against contracts awarded in previous years that have not been updated to reflect the competitive/noncompetitive classification. Spend may also be for local purchases (less than \$10K) and thus not against a contract but through credit cards or other local payment methods.

